

Report Documentation Page				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.					
1. REPORT DATE <b>29 JUN 2012</b>		2. REPORT TYPE		3. DATES COVERED <b>00-00-2012 to 00-00-2012</b>	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE <b>Military Base Realignments and Closures: Updated Costs and Savings Estimates from BRAC 2005</b>				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S)				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) <b>U.S. Government Accountability Office, 441 G Street NW, Washington, DC, 20548</b>				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT <b>Approved for public release; distribution unlimited</b>					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT <b>Same as Report (SAR)</b>	18. NUMBER OF PAGES <b>52</b>	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT <b>unclassified</b>	b. ABSTRACT <b>unclassified</b>	c. THIS PAGE <b>unclassified</b>			



United States Government Accountability Office  
Washington, DC 20548

---

June 29, 2012

The Honorable Carl Levin  
Chairman  
The Honorable John McCain  
Ranking Member  
Committee on Armed Services  
United States Senate

The Honorable Daniel K. Inouye  
Chairman  
The Honorable Thad Cochran  
Ranking Member  
Subcommittee on Defense  
Committee on Appropriations  
United States Senate

The Honorable Howard "Buck" McKeon  
Chairman  
The Honorable Adam Smith  
Ranking Member  
Committee on Armed Services  
House of Representatives

The Honorable C. W. Bill Young  
Chairman  
The Honorable Norman D. Dicks  
Ranking Member  
Subcommittee on Defense  
Committee on Appropriations  
House of Representatives

Subject: *Military Base Realignments and Closures: Updated Costs and Savings Estimates from BRAC 2005*

The Department of Defense's (DOD) cost estimates to implement recommendations from the most recent Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) round have increased and estimated savings resulting from the round have decreased compared to the estimates from the 2005 BRAC Commission. BRAC 2005 was the fifth round of base closures and realignments undertaken by DOD since 1988, and it was the biggest, most complex BRAC round ever.

To implement this round, DOD executed hundreds of BRAC actions involving over 800 defense locations and the planned relocation of over 125,000 personnel. By law, BRAC 2005 recommendations were to be implemented by September 15, 2011.<sup>1</sup>

At the outset of BRAC 2005, the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) indicated that DOD viewed BRAC 2005 as a unique opportunity to reshape its installations and realign its forces to meet defense needs for the next 20 years. In accordance with the statute authorizing BRAC 2005,<sup>2</sup> DOD proposed the selection criteria to be used to develop and evaluate the candidate recommendations, and Congress subsequently codified those criteria.<sup>3</sup>

As in prior BRAC rounds, criteria relating to the goal of enhancing “military value”<sup>4</sup> were to be given priority consideration, with other criteria to be considered including the extent and timing of potential costs and savings, economic impact to local communities, and other considerations. When applied in the context of the transformational goals set by the Secretary of Defense for BRAC 2005, these criteria resulted in many of the BRAC 2005 recommendations involving complex realignments, such as designating where military forces returning to the United States from overseas bases would be located; establishing joint military medical centers; creating joint bases; and reconfiguring the defense supply, storage, and distribution network.

Nevertheless, anticipated savings resulting from implementing the recommendations remained an important consideration in justifying the need for another BRAC round. In a 2001 testimony before Congress, the Secretary of Defense stated that another BRAC round would generate recurring savings the department could use for other defense programs. However, as we have previously reported, the 2005 round is unlike previous BRAC rounds because of OSD’s emphasis on transformation and jointness, rather than just reducing excess infrastructure. Before DOD could begin to realize savings from BRAC 2005, it needed to invest billions of dollars in facility construction, renovation, and other up-front expenses. The BRAC Commission estimated that these one-time implementation costs would total about \$21 billion; in contrast, DOD spent about \$25 billion<sup>5</sup> to implement the four previous BRAC rounds combined. The

---

<sup>1</sup> The BRAC process is governed by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, originally passed as Title XXIX of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991, Pub. L. No. 101-510 (1990). It has subsequently been amended many times, including in 2001, when Congress authorized BRAC 2005 as part of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002, Pub. L. No. 107-107 (2001).

<sup>2</sup> The statute authorizing BRAC 2005, Pub. L. No. 107-107, § 3002 (2001), amended the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 by inserting a new section, § 2913, which established “military value” as the primary consideration for BRAC recommendations and specified a number of considerations for determining military value, along with other selection criteria.

<sup>3</sup> DOD spelled out its final criteria at 69 Fed. Reg. 6948 (2004). Congress codified the criteria as adopted by DOD, with only minor modifications. Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005, Pub. L. No. 108-375, § 2832 (2004).

<sup>4</sup> Military value relate to such considerations as an installation’s current and future mission capabilities, condition, ability to accommodate future needs, and cost of operations. The criteria are spelled out at § 2913(b) of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (as amended).

<sup>5</sup> This dollar amount is based on DOD’s fiscal year 2011 budget submission to Congress to pay for continuing implementation of recommendations from prior BRAC rounds (BRAC 1988, 1991, 1993, and 1995). This amount does not include other costs associated with BRAC, such as costs to complete environmental cleanup at BRAC bases in future years and costs incurred by other DOD and federal

Commission also calculated that, taking into account the time value of money, over a 20-year period ending in 2025, DOD would achieve a positive net present value<sup>6</sup> of about \$36 billion, and it estimated that the net annual recurring savings<sup>7</sup> that would accrue from implementing BRAC 2005 recommendations would be around \$4.2 billion.

In December 2007, we reported that DOD planned to spend more and save less than the BRAC Commission expected, and DOD's 20-year net present value would be less than half of the Commission's original estimate.<sup>8</sup> That report also found that DOD's BRAC cost and savings estimates were likely to continue to evolve due to uncertainties surrounding implementation details and potential increases in military construction. In each of two subsequent GAO reports and a recent testimony covering BRAC 2005 costs and savings, we found that DOD's estimated one-time BRAC implementation costs had further increased, net annual recurring savings estimates had further decreased, and the 20-year net present value was diminishing.<sup>9</sup>

The House Armed Services Committee report accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 directs us to monitor the implementation of recommendations for the 2005 round of closures and realignments of military installations.<sup>10</sup> This report updates the costs and savings associated with BRAC 2005 through the end of the implementation period. We will continue to analyze BRAC 2005 implementation and will issue a lessons learned report to conclude our reporting in response to this congressional directive later this year. A list of our prior work related to military base closures and realignments since the Secretary of Defense submitted his proposed BRAC actions to the BRAC Commission for review in May 2005 can be found at the end of this report. For this report, our objectives were to evaluate (1) how DOD's costs to implement BRAC 2005 recommendations compared to the BRAC Commission's estimates and the factors that contributed to cost increases, and (2) what 20-year net present value and net annual recurring savings DOD can expect by implementing

---

agencies to provide assistance to communities and individuals impacted by BRAC. DOD's budget submission is reported in current dollars (i.e., it includes projected inflation).

<sup>6</sup> Net present value is a financial calculation that accounts for the time value of money by determining the present value of future savings minus up-front investment costs over a specific period of time. Determining net present value is important because it illustrates both the up-front investment costs and long-term savings in a single amount. In the context of BRAC implementation, net present value is calculated for a 20-year period from 2006 through 2025.

<sup>7</sup> The net annual recurring savings is calculated by deducting DOD estimates of the annual recurring costs from the annual recurring savings that are expected to accrue in 2012, the year after the BRAC 2005 recommendations have been completed and are expected to be in a steady state.

<sup>8</sup> GAO, *Military Base Realignments and Closures: Cost Estimates Have Increased and Are Likely to Continue to Evolve*, [GAO-08-159](#) (Washington, D.C.: Dec. 11, 2007).

<sup>9</sup> GAO, *Military Base Realignments and Closures: DOD Faces Challenges in Implementing Recommendations on Time and Is Not Consistently Updating Savings Estimates*, [GAO-09-217](#) (Washington, D.C.: Jan. 30, 2009); *Military Base Realignments and Closures: Estimated Costs Have Increased While Savings Estimates Have Decreased Since Fiscal Year 2009*, [GAO-10-98R](#) (Washington, D.C.: Nov. 13, 2009); and *Military Base Realignments and Closures. Key Factors Contributing to BRAC 2005 Results*, [GAO-12-513T](#) (Washington, D.C.: Mar. 8, 2012).

<sup>10</sup> H.R. Rep. No. 110-146, at 514 (2007).

the 2005 BRAC recommendations and what factors have contributed to the overall decrease in savings from this round.

### **Scope and Methodology**

To assess DOD's cost estimates of implementing BRAC 2005, we examined the initial cost estimates in the BRAC Commission's Report to the President and compared them to our analyses of data in DOD's fiscal year 2011 BRAC 2005 budget submission to Congress.<sup>11</sup> In addition, we discussed with the military departments' BRAC offices the reasons for cost increases and reviewed OSD's business plans for recommendations that had the largest increases in costs to determine the reasons for the changes, and discussed them with OSD officials, and officials in the military departments and defense agencies as appropriate. To evaluate changes in DOD's projected 20-year net present value estimates from the BRAC Commission's 2005 estimates, we examined the data in DOD's fiscal year 2011 BRAC 2005 budget submission to Congress. For consistency in making comparisons to the BRAC Commission's original estimates, we applied the same formulas and discount rate of 2.8 percent that the BRAC Commission used to calculate the 20-year net present value estimates in 2005. To evaluate changes in DOD's projected net annual recurring savings from the BRAC Commission's 2005 estimates through fiscal year 2011, we used data OSD provided to us for estimated savings in fiscal year 2012—the year after OSD expected all recommendations to be completed. We determined that the data used were sufficiently reliable for the purposes of addressing the objectives of this report. We performed this work from March 2012 to June 2012 in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives.

### **Summary**

Our analysis of DOD's fiscal year 2011 update relating to the BRAC 2005 budget submission to Congress shows that one-time implementation costs grew from \$21 billion originally estimated by the BRAC Commission in 2005 to about \$35.1 billion,<sup>12</sup> an increase of about \$14.1 billion, or 67 percent,<sup>13</sup> largely due to increased construction costs. We compared the BRAC Commission's 2005 estimates to DOD's fiscal year 2011 budget submission and found that 14 of 182<sup>14</sup> BRAC recommendations accounted for about 72 percent of the cost increase, or about

---

<sup>11</sup> We used fiscal year 2011 budget data because these data comprise DOD's final request to fund the BRAC 2005 account before the September 15, 2011, statutory deadline for completion of closures and realignments for the 2005 round.

<sup>12</sup> The \$35.1 billion includes \$1.2 billion in program management and administration costs that are spread across the BRAC 2005 implementation program.

<sup>13</sup> The \$35.1 billion in one-time implementation cost DOD calculated using fiscal year 2011 dollars for its budget requests, which includes inflation, while the BRAC Commission estimate of \$21 billion is in constant fiscal year 2005 dollars, which excludes inflation. In constant 2005 dollars, costs increased to about \$32.2 billion, an increase of 53 percent.

<sup>14</sup> The BRAC Commission forwarded 182 recommendations to the President who approved them in their entirety. Our analysis shows DOD requested funds to implement 175 recommendations because seven recommendations do not involve implementation costs for various reasons.

\$10.2 billion. Our analysis of those 14 recommendations shows that increased construction costs resulted primarily from additional building projects and additions to planned projects, which DOD deemed necessary after implementation began. For example, one-time costs for realigning the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency more than doubled from \$1.1 billion to \$2.6 billion, with military construction accounting for nearly \$726 million of that increase due to additional supporting facilities the agency identified as essential to the mission. Overall, military construction costs for the BRAC 2005 round increased 86 percent, from \$13.2 billion estimated by the BRAC Commission to \$24.5 billion according to DOD's fiscal year 2011 BRAC budget, while over the same time period, general inflation increased by 13.7 percent. In contrast, military construction costs for the four prior BRAC rounds combined amounted to less than \$7 billion. Other reasons for implementation cost increases included increased operation and maintenance costs, such as for furnishings to outfit new and renovated buildings and information technology needed to equip additional facilities, and higher environmental restoration costs.

Due primarily to the large increase in one-time implementation costs, the 20-year net present value DOD can expect by implementing the 2005 BRAC recommendations has decreased by 72 percent, and our analysis of net annual recurring savings shows a decrease of 9.5 percent compared to the BRAC 2005 Commission's estimates. The 20-year net present value—that is, the present value of future savings minus the present value of up-front investment costs—of \$35.6 billion estimated by the Commission in 2005 for this BRAC round has decreased by 72 percent to about \$9.9 billion.<sup>15</sup> We believe that the 20-year net present value of BRAC recommendations is a good measure of the net result from up-front implementation costs and the resulting savings because it takes into account the time value of money; that is, it considers when a dollar amount, such as savings, is received during the 20-year period. In 2005, the BRAC Commission approved 30 recommendations that were expected to produce a negative 20-year net present value (in other words, at the end of the 20-year period, those 30 recommendations would result in net costs). Based on our analysis, currently 75 out of the 182 Commission-approved recommendations, about 41 percent, are now expected to result in a negative 20-year net present value. Nine recommendations have seen their net present value decrease by over \$1 billion each. Also, our analysis of DOD's fiscal year 2011 update of the BRAC 2005 budget submission to Congress shows that DOD's net annual recurring savings estimates have decreased by \$400 million to about \$3.8 billion, a 9.5 percent decrease from the Commission's estimate of \$4.2 billion.<sup>16</sup>

We are not making recommendations in this report. We provided DOD with a draft copy of this report for review and comment. DOD concurred with the findings of our report and these comments are reprinted in enclosure VII.

---

<sup>15</sup> We calculated the 20-year net present value estimate in constant fiscal year 2005 dollars (i.e., it excludes projected inflation) to be consistent with DOD and the BRAC Commission's methodology and reporting of this estimate.

<sup>16</sup> The net annual recurring savings is calculated by deducting DOD estimates of the annual recurring costs from the annual recurring savings that are expected to accrue in 2012, the year after the BRAC 2005 recommendations have been completed and will be in a steady state.

## Estimated Implementation Costs Increased by Almost 68 Percent, Mostly Due to Funding Military Construction Projects Not Included in Original Cost Estimates

Our analysis of DOD's fiscal year 2011 BRAC budget shows that estimated one-time costs to implement 2005 BRAC recommendations increased by 67 percent, or about \$14.1 billion, from the \$21 billion the BRAC Commission estimated in 2005, to a total of \$35.1 billion.<sup>17</sup>

### Fourteen BRAC Recommendations Accounted for 72 Percent of the Cost Increase

Our analysis of the cost increase shows that 14 out of the 182 recommendations included in this round, accounted for about 72 percent of the cost increase, or about \$10.2 billion, as shown in table 1.

**Table 1: 14 BRAC Recommendations with the Largest Dollar Increases in One-Time Costs Compared to 2005 BRAC Commission Estimates**

(Dollars in millions)

BRAC recommendation (Commission number)	2005 BRAC Commission estimate	Fiscal year 2011 DOD budget	Dollar increase
1. Realign Walter Reed Army Medical Center to Bethesda National Naval Medical Center, MD, and to Fort Belvoir, VA (# 169)	\$988.8	\$2,720.4	\$1,731.6
2. Close National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency leased locations and realign others at Fort Belvoir, VA (# 168)	1,117.3	2,553.3	1,436.0
3. Close Fort Monmouth, NJ (# 5)	780.4	1,866.4	1,086.0
4. Establish San Antonio Regional Medical Center and realign enlisted medical training to Fort Sam Houston, TX (# 172)	1,040.9	1,993.9	953.0
5. Realign Maneuver Training to Fort Benning, GA (# 9)	773.1	1,688.2	915.1
6. Co-locate miscellaneous OSD, defense agency, and field activity leased locations (#133)	601.8	1,428.3	826.6
7. Realign to establish Combat Service Support Center at Fort Lee, VA (#121)	754.0	1,419.9	665.9
8. Close Fort McPherson, GA (# 3)	214.5	804.8	590.2
9. Consolidate Defense Information Systems Agency at Fort Meade, MD (# 140)	220.0	\$601.8	381.9
10. Relocate Army headquarters and field operating activities (# 148)	199.9	578.4	378.5
11. Realign supply, storage, and distribution management (# 177)	192.7	539.5	346.8

<sup>17</sup> The BRAC Commission estimates are in constant (i.e., exclude projected inflation) 2005 dollars, while DOD's fiscal year 2011 estimates are in current (i.e., include projected inflation) dollars. When deflated to constant 2005 dollars, the current one-time implementation cost becomes \$32.2 billion, an increase of about 53 percent from the BRAC Commission's estimate.

<b>BRAC recommendation</b> (Commission number)	<b>2005 BRAC Commission estimate</b>	<b>Fiscal year 2011 DOD budget</b>	<b>Dollar increase</b>
12. Consolidate depot-level reparable procurement management (# 176)	124.9	432.0	307.1
13. Co-locate military department investigation agencies with DOD Counterintelligence and Security Agency at Marine Corps Base Quantico, VA (# 131)	172.0	472.5	300.5
14. Close Brooks City-Base, TX (# 170)	325.3	608.2	282.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$7,505.4</b>	<b>\$17,707.7</b>	<b>\$10,202.1</b>

Source: GAO analysis of 2005 BRAC Commission data and DOD's fiscal year 2011 BRAC budget data.

Note: Totals may not equal the sum of each column due to rounding.

Upon closer examination of these 14 BRAC recommendations, we found that the cost increases were mostly a result of increased military construction costs. Overall, military construction costs for the BRAC 2005 round increased from \$13.2 billion estimated by the BRAC Commission to \$24.5 billion, an 86 percent increase, while over the same time period, general inflation increased by 13.7 percent. In contrast, military construction costs for the four prior BRAC rounds combined amounted to less than \$7 billion. Military construction costs increased because after implementation began, DOD identified requirements for new construction projects as well as for additions to planned construction projects, which were not accounted for in the original cost estimates. Requirements changed because DOD's information provided to the BRAC Commission assumed that adequate capacity existed to fully accommodate the workload and workforce relocating to an existing facility and that the physical condition of existing buildings would be acceptable and suitable for the intended relocation and mission. Other factors contributing to cost increases to implement the recommendations we examined included inflation over the 6-year implementation period for construction materials and transportation, underestimated requirements for outfitting or furnishing buildings, and information technology requirements.

Details of the 14 BRAC recommendations we examined are as follows:

1. **Realign Walter Reed Army Medical Center to Bethesda National Naval Medical Center, Maryland, and to Fort Belvoir, Virginia (\$1.7 billion increase).** This recommendation expanded the National Naval Medical Center, which was renamed the Walter Reed National Military Medical Center, and included constructing a new community hospital and dental clinic at Fort Belvoir. One-time implementation costs increased by \$1.7 billion (175 percent) mostly due to additional military construction requirements to address numerous issues unique to the medical center, such as concerns raised by a congressionally directed study group to examine the need to provide better medical care for wounded and ill warfighters. In 2008, Congress established the expectation that the new Walter Reed National Military Medical Center and new military hospital at Fort Belvoir should be "world-class" medical facilities.<sup>18</sup> Thus, DOD took various actions to implement this recommendation that were not

<sup>18</sup> Pub. L. No. 110-417, § 2721; 122 Stat. 4716 (2008). The May 2009 report by the National Capital Region Base Realignment and Closure Health Systems Advisory Subcommittee of the Defense Health Board, prepared in response to this congressional direction, defined a "world-class medical facility" as one that, among other things, routinely performs at the theoretical limit of what is possible.



anticipated in 2005 when the recommendation became binding, contributing to an about \$1.3 billion increase in constructing new medical facilities.

2. **Close National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency leased locations and realign others at Fort Belvoir, Virginia (\$1.4 billion increase).** This recommendation consolidated various leased locations by closing other locations of the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency, and it constructed a new facility at Fort Belvoir. One-time costs to implement this recommendation increased \$1.4 billion (129 percent) from the initial BRAC Commission estimate of \$1.1 billion. Military construction costs increased by about \$726 million from the initial estimate of \$950,000, due to new requirements not included in the initial estimate for additional supporting facilities the agency identified as essential to mission operability, such as the need for a technology center and a warehouse that resulted in a 200,000 square footage increase at the new facility. Also, costs for information technology equipment and software, internal communication cabling, and furnishings to outfit the new buildings were not included in initial estimates.
3. **Close Fort Monmouth, New Jersey (\$1.1 billion increase).** This recommendation closed Fort Monmouth and realigned various functions such as information systems, sensors, electronic warfare, electronics research and development & acquisition functions, and various administrative functions to Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, and other installations such as Fort Belvoir, Virginia, and Fort Meade, Maryland. In addition, this recommendation relocated the U.S. Army Military Academy Preparatory School from Fort Monmouth to West Point, New York. One-time implementation costs increased \$1.1 billion (139 percent) due in part to evolving requirements associated with the construction of the Command, Control, Communications, Computers, Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance Center of Excellence for Communications and Electronics Laboratories at Aberdeen Proving Ground. Further analysis of mission requirements by the Army after implementation began resulted in an increase of approximately 750,000 square feet of additional construction for the Center. Also, the Army identified the need for additional infrastructure improvements at Aberdeen such as utilities, roads, and information technology upgrades. Further, the Military Academy Preparatory School experienced increases in costs largely due to an Army analysis that new construction was needed because existing facilities were not available. In addition, limited construction space at West Point where the Army wanted to locate the preparatory school required the relocation of an existing motor pool that also increased costs. As a result of these new requirements, military construction costs for relocating the Military Academy Preparatory School experienced about a \$127 million (449 percent) increase over initial Commission estimates.
4. **Establish San Antonio Regional Medical Center and Realign Enlisted Medical Training to Fort Sam Houston, Texas (\$953 million increase).** This recommendation established the San Antonio Regional Medical Center at Fort Sam Houston, Texas, by relocating inpatient medical care from Lackland Air Force Base, Texas, and realigning DOD basic and specialty enlisted medical training from four other DOD installations to Fort Sam Houston. This was done to develop a joint training center to improve interoperability and joint deployability. One-time implementation costs increased \$953 million (92 percent) for several reasons, such as the identification of additional requirements to move medical inpatient care functions from Wilford Hall Medical Center at Lackland Air Force Base to Fort Sam Houston. Additionally, according to DOD officials, requirements for instructional and laboratory space expanded to accommodate an over 40-percent increase in the number of students DOD expected to receive medical training at Fort Sam Houston compared to initial assumptions, resulting in more military construction than initially anticipated. Further, Army officials told us

that some cost increases were due to renovation of historic buildings and that those additional costs were not anticipated in the initial cost estimate. Also, the standard dormitory construction assumptions used to initially cost out the needed construction did not, according to Army officials, include accommodation for the female student population that would be at Fort Sam Houston. Finally, the cost of various operation and maintenance activities, such as moving people and equipping the medical center, were higher than initially estimated.

5. **Realign Maneuver Training to Fort Benning, Georgia (\$915 million increase).** This recommendation combined training and doctrine development for ground forces by relocating the Armor Center and School from Fort Knox, Kentucky, to Fort Benning, Georgia, and establishing the Maneuver Center of Excellence. The recommendation also realigned Fort McCoy, Wisconsin, by relocating the 84th Army Reserve Regional Training Center into space at Fort Knox vacated by the Armor Center and School, and activated an Infantry Brigade Combat Team at Fort Knox by relocating engineer, military police, and combat service support units from Europe and Korea. One-time implementation costs increased \$915 million (118 percent). About 92 percent of the cost increase—about \$880 million—was due to additional facilities requirements for the Maneuver Center that were identified after the recommendation was approved. For example, the Army identified the need for medical facilities and other projects to support Maneuver Center training, which were not included in the BRAC Commission's initial estimate. The additional facilities that were constructed also required nearly another \$135 million in operation and maintenance costs for furnishings, equipment, transportation, and relocation costs for the Armor School, as well as moving and severance costs for civilian employees.
6. **Co-locate miscellaneous OSD, defense agency, and field activity leased locations (\$827 million increase).** This recommendation closed various leased locations, relocated about 6,400 personnel within the National Capital Region to Fort Belvoir, Virginia, and relocated the Defense Contract Management Agency to Fort Lee, Virginia. One-time implementation costs increased by about \$827 million (137 percent). DOD experienced various delays in the process to construct a new permanent site for the facility. The Army's original plan for this recommendation was to construct a facility on the engineering proving grounds at Fort Belvoir but OSD BRAC officials told us that after experiencing local opposition to the density of population on the site, the Army competitively selected an alternative site that became part of Fort Belvoir.<sup>19</sup> The delays increased costs because the facility had to be built with a compressed timetable so DOD would meet the mandatory BRAC completion date of September 15, 2011. In addition, other infrastructure requirements that were not included in initial estimates, such as a parking structure at the facility, increased costs by almost \$193 million. Also, actual costs for telecommunications and information technology were nearly \$44 million higher than estimated.
7. **Realign to establish Combat Service Support Center at Fort Lee, Virginia (\$666 million increase).** This recommendation realigned various combat service support functions from four other installations to establish a combined Combat Service Support Center at Fort Lee,

---

<sup>19</sup> Section 2708 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008, Pub. L. No. 110-181 (2008) specified a site selection process that required the Army to consider a General Services Administration (GSA)-controlled site in Springfield, VA, and select a site "based on the best value to the government" considering cost and schedule. The proposal process identified two private sites that the Army compared against a GSA site and sites on Fort Belvoir. The Mark Center site was acquired after being selected as the best value.

Virginia. One-time implementation costs increased by \$660 million (88 percent), driven primarily by facility construction costs. Requirements for establishing the Combat Service Support Center were more fully developed in the early stages of implementation, which not only increased the scope of planned construction, but also identified the need to build a new Warrior Training Facility at Fort A. P. Hill, Virginia, as well as a health and dental clinic at Fort Lee. There were also smaller increases in the costs of environmental compliance, and transportation costs for moving equipment such as oversized tactical vehicles and weapon systems from Aberdeen Proving Ground to Fort Lee.

8. **Close Fort McPherson, Georgia (\$590 million increase).** This recommendation closed Fort McPherson and relocated the Army's Forces Command headquarters and the Army Reserve Command headquarters to Fort Bragg, North Carolina.<sup>20</sup> Also, this recommendation relocated the Third Army headquarters to Shaw Air Force Base, South Carolina. One-time implementation costs increased \$590 million (275 percent). The identification of additional project requirements, such as additional headquarters facilities and housing at Fort Bragg, Shaw Air Force Base, and other locations, increased military construction costs. Also, the cost for the combined U.S. Army Forces Command and U.S. Army Reserve Command Headquarters at Fort Bragg and the Third Army headquarters facility at Shaw Air Force Base increased because of increased square footage requirements that were not originally identified. The costs for furnishings, collateral equipment, and other outfitting costs associated with these added military construction projects and expanded scope increased from about \$92 million to about \$232 million. Also, environmental costs increased from about \$1 million to about \$10 million because of the higher cost of complying with the National Environmental Policy Act as well as the shifting of environmental restoration requirements into the 6-year implementation period. Information technology costs increased from nearly \$20 million to \$139 million due to the corresponding information technology requirements for the added military construction projects and more refined costs for installation of communications, automation, and information systems equipment.
9. **Consolidate Defense Information Systems Agency at Fort Meade, Maryland (\$382 million increase).** This recommendation closed leased locations and realigned various other functions at a 1 million square foot facility at Fort Meade, Maryland. One-time implementation costs increased about \$382 million (174 percent). The majority of this cost growth was caused by increased military construction and information technology requirements that were understated in the initial estimates. For example, the amount of square footage for a laboratory and a controlled humidity warehouse used by the agency in leased locations was understated in original estimates for the new facility. In addition, initial estimates did not include all costs to furnish the new facility. Information technology requirements, which were originally estimated at about \$17 million dollars, increased to about \$95 million when the agency identified the need to duplicate its existing information technology infrastructure in the new facility.
10. **Relocate Army headquarters and field operating activities (\$379 million increase).** DOD relocated several Army commands and regional offices to various locations such as Fort Sam Houston, Texas; Fort Knox, Kentucky; and Redstone Arsenal, Alabama, to create operating efficiencies. Several factors contributed to the increase in one-time implementation costs of \$379 million (189 percent). For example, new construction projects

---

<sup>20</sup> The BRAC Commission, in another recommendation, directed the Air Force to transfer real property accountability for Pope Air Force Base to the Army, making it part of Fort Bragg.

added after the Commission estimate was computed increased military construction costs by over \$65 million. These projects included the Installation Management Command Headquarters building, the renovation of a historic theater for the Family, Morale, Welfare and Recreation Command, and associated parking and road improvements. There was also an increase of almost \$30 million to originally planned construction projects. An additional \$33 million in increased costs were caused by adjusted requirements for civilian moves, civilian severance, collateral equipment, furnishings, restored leave, contract termination, and transportation. Further, information technology costs increased from an initial estimate of nearly \$2 million to about \$58 million because of information technology requirements associated with construction of the additional projects as well as information technology requirements for Army headquarters organizations. There were also added costs of over \$41 million for personnel-related costs and transportation of equipment.

11. **Realign supply, storage, and distribution management (\$347 million increase).** This recommendation was to achieve economies and efficiencies to enhance logistic support effectiveness by reconfiguring DOD's wholesale supply, storage, and distribution network across the United States while also consolidating these functions at several military maintenance depots. Viewed as one of the more complicated recommendations put forth by DOD, one-time implementation costs increased \$347 million (180 percent) primarily for information technology. Information technology efforts related to this recommendation involved complex business process reengineering efforts, including software development and synchronizing several existing and evolving information technology systems, in addition to equipment purchases. Further, military construction costs increased, mostly attributable to the following three factors. First, the defense distribution depot at Susquehanna, Pennsylvania, had excess capacity when DOD was developing the recommendation, but after the recommendation became binding the depot no longer had the capacity to store all the supplies that the BRAC recommendation originally envisioned, thus requiring new construction for extra storage space. Second, the cost increased because a facility that was designated to be a new Strategic Distribution Platform at Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma, as part of this recommendation, was originally included in the estimates for another recommendation. However, we were told that when the BRAC Commission changed the other recommendation the military construction was not incorporated back into this recommendation. In addition, needed upgrades to the facility were not included in the original estimates. Third, Warner-Robins' Strategic Distribution Platform, Georgia required more space than envisioned due to a data input error. The needed square footage was entered into the BRAC database as 20,000 square feet when it should have been 200,000 square feet. Thus, additional construction was needed to build the required storage space. In addition, costs to integrate each of the services' inventory management systems with the Defense Logistics Agency's systems were higher than anticipated. Other cost increases included costs for re-warehousing stock at the strategic distribution platforms;<sup>21</sup> consolidating storage at the forward distribution points, redistributing inventories among various distribution depots; and modifying existing contracts.

12. **Consolidate depot-level reparable procurement management (\$307 million increase).** This recommendation realigned procurement and related support functions at 13 locations by consolidating depot-level reparable procurement within the Defense Logistics Agency,

---

<sup>21</sup> A strategic distribution platform is a regional hub consisting of multiple spokes, known as forward distribution points, which provide supplies to designated customers. Under this recommendation, distribution depots no longer needed for regional supply were realigned as forward distribution points, and all their supply and storage functions were consolidated.

completing the transfer of remaining consumable item management to the Defense Logistics Agency, and relocating integrated material management functions to other locations, including Detroit Arsenal, Michigan. One-time implementation costs increased \$307 million (246 percent) mainly as a result of changes in military construction and information technology requirements. Military construction costs increased primarily because of changes in the construction planned for the movement of personnel from Rock Island, Illinois, to Detroit Arsenal. These changes included a larger administrative building than originally planned because contractor personnel were not included in the original estimate, and the construction of a parking garage instead of a parking lot. Also, information technology costs increased because the initial estimates were based on incomplete data that did not reflect business processes and other information technology requirements.

**13. Co-locate military department investigation agencies with DOD Counterintelligence and Security Agency at Marine Corps Base Quantico, Virginia (\$301 million increase).**

This recommendation closed various leased locations and realigned various counterintelligence and investigative functions to Marine Corps Base, Quantico, Virginia. One-time implementation costs increased \$301 million (175 percent) largely because the required square footage needed for the facility was underestimated. According to Navy officials, initial square footage estimates were underestimated because they did not include space for contractors or students that train at the facility. As a result, military construction increased \$222 million over initial Commission estimates.

**14. Close Brooks City Base, Texas (\$283 million increase).** This recommendation closed Brooks City-Base, realigned Holloman Air Force Base, New Mexico, and relocated several Air Force, Army, and Navy medical missions to Lackland Air Force Base, Randolph Air Force Base, Texas; Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio; and Fort Sam Houston, Texas. One-time implementation costs increased \$283 million (87 percent). The primary drivers of cost growth were additional requirements identified after the initial estimate, which increased military construction costs. For example, at Fort Sam Houston, the initial cost estimate took into account only the Army's facilities requirements and left out both Navy and Air Force requirements, which, according to Air Force officials, added \$74 million in construction costs. At Lackland Air Force Base, the amount of square footage required increased by 56,000 square feet because more personnel needed to be accommodated than initially estimated. Also at Lackland, the renovation of existing facilities required moving current occupants to other facilities, and those costs were not captured in the initial estimates. At Wright-Patterson and Randolph Air Force Bases, military construction costs increased from an estimated \$208 million to \$230 million because, among other things, DOD's and the BRAC Commission's original estimates did not take into account that the cost to renovate historic buildings is greater than the standard planning factors used to estimate renovation costs. In addition, projects to restore the property at Brooks City Base and Holloman Air Force Base to usable, suitable condition contributed to the cost increase. Environmental requirements such as environmental policy compliance and restoration activities were not included in the original cost estimates and added \$21 million to implementation costs. Costs for operation and maintenance increased by \$96 million because requirements for transporting equipment from Brooks to the new locations increased, the cost of moving the personnel from Holloman Air Force Base to Wright-Patterson increased, and the cost to purchase needed equipment to allow dual operations or contracted support for uninterrupted capabilities provided by the research laboratories and the School of Aerospace Medicine during the transition from Brooks City Base increased. Civilian personnel costs were also higher than estimated because about 40 percent of the civilian workforce actually transferred to the new locations, but only 20 percent were expected to do so.

## Implementation Costs for Five Recommendations Increased by over 1,000 Percent

In addition to the 14 recommendations that had the largest dollar increases in estimated costs, we also identified five recommendations that experienced cost increases of over 1,000 percent compared to the BRAC Commission's estimates, as shown in table 2.

**Table 2: BRAC Recommendations with over 1,000 Percent Increases in One-Time Costs**  
(Dollars in millions)

BRAC recommendation (Commission number)	2005 BRAC Commission estimate	Fiscal year 2011 DOD budget	Dollar increase	Percentage increase
1. Realign to establish Joint Center for consolidated transportation management training at Fort Lee, VA (#122)	\$1.5	\$29.1	\$27.6	1,840
2. Realign to establish Joint Center of Excellence for religious training and education at Fort Jackson, SC (#124)	1.0	14.9	13.9	1,394
3. Realign Single Drill Sergeant School to Fort Jackson, SC (#50)	1.8	27.2	25.4	1,411
4. Realign to establish Joint Center of Excellence for culinary training at Fort Lee, VA (#123)	5.4	73.1	67.7	1,254
5. Consolidate Army Test and Evaluation command Headquarters at Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD (#136)	7.1	93.0	85.9	1,210
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$16.8</b>	<b>\$237.3</b>	<b>\$ 220.5</b>	

Source: GAO analysis of 2005 BRAC Commission data and DOD's fiscal year 2011 BRAC budget data.

Note: Totals may not equal the sum of each column due to rounding.

Our analysis of the recommendations listed in table 2—as with the 14 recommendations that demonstrated the largest dollar cost increases—showed these recommendations also had new or unanticipated requirements for military construction that were not included in the initial cost estimates. Factors that contributed to those cost increases are outlined below.

1. **Realign to establish Joint Center for consolidated transportation management training at Fort Lee, Virginia (1,840 percent increase).** This recommendation established a Joint Center for Consolidated Transportation Management Training at Fort Lee to eliminate redundancy by relocating transportation management training at Lackland Air Force Base, Texas. Initially estimated to cost \$1.5 million, this recommendation cost about \$29 million to implement, a cost growth of 1,840 percent. The Commission's cost estimates were based on DOD's assumption that there would be space available at Fort Lee once another BRAC recommendation to establish the Combat Service Support Center, also at Fort Lee, was implemented. However, those facilities were not available, thus requiring new construction of a 53,000 square foot facility that included, among other things, a general instruction building. Further, additional requirements and the cost of construction materials contributed to about \$18 million of the increase. Other factors behind cost increases

included environmental costs, moving costs, information technology, and furnishings associated with the new construction.

2. **Realign to establish Joint Center of Excellence for Religious Training and Education at Fort Jackson, South Carolina (1,394 percent increase).** This recommendation consolidated similar religious educational activities for officers and enlisted personnel and merged common support functions to create the Joint Center of Excellence for Religious Training and Education by relocating religious training and educational from three other locations— Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama; Naval Air Station Meridian, Mississippi; and Naval Station Newport, Rhode Island—to Fort Jackson, South Carolina. Initially projected to cost \$1 million, this recommendation cost over \$14.9 million to implement, a cost increase of 1,394 percent. According to DOD, the total requirement for all facilities for this recommendation was 118,000 square feet, but only 57,000 square feet were available for religious training use at Fort Jackson once implementation began. This caused military construction costs to increase from about a half-million dollars to over \$10 million. The final cost of military construction for this recommendation was over \$11.5 million because of an increase in scope resulting from additional joint requirements. In addition, costs for removal, packing, shipping, and reinstallation of video teletraining equipment and advanced classroom electronic equipment increased by \$1.5 million.
3. **Realign Single Drill Sergeant School to Fort Jackson, South Carolina (1,411, percent increase).** By relocating existing drill sergeant schools from Fort Benning, Georgia, and Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, this recommendation established a consolidated drill sergeant school at Fort Jackson, South Carolina. The Commission's initial estimate, based on DOD's information, was projected to cost \$1.8 million; however, this recommendation cost \$27.2 million to implement, an increase of 1,411 percent. About \$23 million of this cost growth resulted from the need for new military construction because existing facilities, initially thought to be suitable, were later deemed inadequate. After BRAC implementation began, the Army determined that it needed newly constructed space, primarily for classrooms, headquarters administration, and office space, and for a dining area to accommodate the projected 366 students per training cycle expected due to consolidating the three schools at one location. However, the existing training facilities at Fort Jackson were 40 years old and would support a training capacity of only 120 students, far short of the 366 students expected per training cycle. Further, the Army cited a severe shortage of bathing facilities and laundry appliances, and noted that there was inadequate dedicated space for outdoor assembly, drills, and physical training. The Army also determined there were no adequate alternate facilities either on or off the installation that could be used to satisfy the need for the instructional facilities to serve this training mission. Other costs that increased included actual costs to comply with environmental regulations, and additional furnishing, outfitting, and information technology requirements associated with the new construction.
4. **Realign to establish Joint Center of Excellence for Culinary Training at Fort Lee, Virginia (1,254 percent increase).** With this recommendation, DOD consolidated its culinary training at one location, creating the Joint Center of Excellence for Culinary Training by relocating the culinary training from Lackland Air Force Base, Texas, to Fort Lee. While the BRAC Commission approved the recommendation, it noted in its Report to the President, “. . . the ultimate cost of this recommendation is still unclear.” Initially estimated to cost \$5.4 million to implement, this recommendation cost \$73.1 million to implement, an increase of 1,254 percent. Military construction costs were the main reason for the increase. Construction estimates increased from \$4.3 million to \$69.5 million due to expanded

instructional capacity requirements. Additionally, a dormitory and a dining facility were added to support the increased student load.

5. **Consolidate Army Test and Evaluation command Headquarters at Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland (1,210 percent).** This recommendation consolidated DOD's Army Test and Evaluation Command at Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland. The initial cost estimate to implement this recommendation was \$7.1 million, whereas the final implementation cost was \$93 million, an increase of about 1,210 percent. In 2006, the Army planned to place many Army Test and Evaluation Command personnel in existing facilities at Aberdeen Proving Ground but subsequently determined that this option was not feasible due to a lack of contiguous space and developed an alternative to construct a new 2-star headquarters facility at a cost of \$55.5 million. Mission requirements for a top-secret information facility, and a secure network operations center, a secure conference center, and secure video teleconference center, not identified in initial cost estimates, also added to the total cost. Further, initial estimates did not adequately capture requirements to furnish and equip the facility or move the personnel and equipment, resulting in higher costs than expected.

See enclosure I for a list of DOD's estimated costs to implement the recommendations from the 2005 BRAC round and enclosure II for the differences between the BRAC Commission estimates and DOD's fiscal year 2011 budget estimates for each recommendation.

### **Both 20-year Net Present Value and Net Annual Recurring Savings Estimates Have Decreased, Due Largely to Increased Implementation Costs**

Due primarily to the large \$14.1 billion increase in one-time implementation costs, the 20-year net present value of savings DOD can expect by implementing the 2005 BRAC recommendations has decreased by 72 percent, and our analysis of net annual recurring savings shows a decrease of 9.5 percent compared to the BRAC Commission's estimates.

#### Twenty-Year Net Present Value Has Decreased by 72 Percent

Our analysis of DOD's fiscal year 2011 BRAC 2005 budget submission to Congress shows that the 20-year net present value of savings<sup>22</sup> of \$35.6 billion estimated by the Commission in 2005 for this BRAC round have decreased by 72 percent to about \$9.9 billion.<sup>23</sup> We believe that the 20-year net present value of BRAC recommendations is a key indicator of the net result from up-front implementation costs and the resulting savings because it takes into account the time value of money; that is, it considers when a dollar amount, such as savings, is received during the 20-year period. As a result, annual savings and other dollar amounts receive different weights depending on when they occur, reflecting the fact that savings received further into the future are less valuable than savings received sooner. For the 2005 BRAC round, both DOD and the BRAC Commission calculated the net present value over a 20-year period ending in 2025 that we believe provides a comprehensive analysis of expected costs or savings.

---

<sup>22</sup> In the context of BRAC, net present value is the total one-time costs minus the total net savings that DOD expects to incur from fiscal year 2006 through fiscal year 2025 to project 20-year savings at a 2.8 percent discount rate. We used data provided by DOD for fiscal year 2012 expected savings.

<sup>23</sup> Twenty-year net present value figures are expressed in constant fiscal year 2005 dollars.



Our analysis of the change in net present value showed that nine recommendations had decreases over \$1 billion each, and that three of these nine recommendations experienced decreases of over \$2 billion each as shown in table 3.

**Table 3: BRAC 2005 Recommendations with Greatest Decrease in 20-year Net Present Value**

(Dollars in millions)

<b>BRAC recommendation</b> (Commission number)	<b>Dollar change Commission- estimated 20-year net present value</b>  (constant fiscal year 2005 dollars)	<b>Dollar change in one-time costs</b>  (fiscal year 2011 current year dollars)
1. Realign supply, storage, and distribution management (#177)	(\$2,764.1)	\$346.8
2. Close National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency leased locations and realign others at Fort Belvoir, VA (#168)	(2,098.1)	1,436.0
3. Establish joint bases at multiple locations (#146)	(2,093.3)	3.6
4. Realign Walter Reed Army Medical Center to Bethesda National Naval Medical Center, MD, and to Fort Belvoir, VA (#169)	(1,425.7)	1,731.6
5. Co-locate miscellaneous OSD, defense agency, and field activity leased locations (#133)	(1,342.0)	826.6
6. Consolidate depot-level reparable procurement management (#176)	(1,154.0)	307.1
7. Establish San Antonio Regional Medical Center and realign enlisted medical training to Fort Sam Houston, TX (#172)	(1,104.4)	953.0
8. Realign Maneuver Training to Fort Benning, GA (#9)	(1,072.4)	915.1
9. Close Fort Monmouth, NJ (#5)	(\$1,051.2)	\$1,086.0

Source: GAO analysis of 2005 BRAC Commission data and DOD's fiscal year 2011 BRAC budget data.

Eight of the nine recommendations experiencing the greatest decrease in 20-year net present value have been discussed earlier in this report as they were in the group of recommendations where costs increased the most. However, the recommendation to establish joint bases has not been discussed in this report.<sup>24</sup> As depicted in table 3, the 20-year net present value for that recommendation decreased by almost \$2.1 billion. The BRAC Commission estimated in 2005 that joint basing would produce a positive 20-year net present value of \$2.3 billion; however, DOD is now estimating that joint basing efforts will only result in a 20-year net present value of

<sup>24</sup> The 2005 BRAC Commission recommended that DOD establish 12 joint bases by consolidating the management and support of 26 separate Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps installations, which shared a common boundary with or were in close proximity to at least one other base. OSD's 2008 guidance on implementing joint basing provided for the creation of a set of joint base common standards for installation support functions—such as for installation security, custodial services, and child care programs—that defined the level of service each joint base is to provide. GAO expects to issue a separate report on joint basing later this year.

about \$249 million. As we reported in 2009,<sup>25</sup> the joint basing initiative may be increasing rather than cutting costs, at least in the short term, because, prior to joint basing, the military services had not normally funded installation support in the amounts needed to meet their existing standards, and DOD now requires the joint bases to deliver installation support in accordance with the new standards. DOD officials stated that the increased support costs at the joint bases might be at least partially offset over time as experience is gained and new efficiencies are identified and adopted. Table 3 also illustrates how increases in up-front costs can negatively affect the net present value of a recommendation.

In addition to the decline in 20-year net present value, the number of recommendations that are expected to produce a negative 20-year net present value (in other words, at the end of the 20-year period, those recommendations will incur higher costs than any savings) has increased significantly. Specifically, DOD proposed 23 recommendations to the BRAC Commission that were based on its assessment of high military value but were expected to have a negative 20-year net present value. After its review, the Commission approved 30 recommendations that were expected to result in negative 20-year net present value. However, our analysis of DOD's 2011 BRAC budget data shows DOD is now expecting 75 out of 182 Commission-approved BRAC 2005 recommendations (41 percent) to have a negative net present value in the same 20-year period. In contrast, only four recommendations DOD developed in all four prior BRAC rounds combined were not expected to result in a positive 20-year net present value. See enclosure III for a list of 20-year net present value estimates for all BRAC 2005 recommendations and enclosure IV for the differences between the BRAC Commission estimates and DOD's fiscal year 2011 budget estimates for each recommendation.

#### Net Annual Recurring BRAC Savings Have Decreased by 9.5 Percent

With regard to annual recurring savings, our analysis of DOD's fiscal year 2011 BRAC 2005 budget submission to Congress shows that DOD's net annual recurring savings estimates resulting from BRAC 2005 have decreased by \$400 million to about \$3.8 billion,<sup>26</sup> a 9.5 percent decrease from the Commission's estimate of \$4.2 billion.<sup>27</sup> Three recommendations—two related to realigning defense logistics functions and one to develop joint bases—accounted for most of the decrease in net annual recurring savings, primarily due to estimated efficiencies that did not materialize. Specifically, the net annual recurring savings to realign supply, storage, and distribution management decreased by \$184.5 million, and for the recommendation to consolidate depot-level reparable procurement management decreased by almost \$76 million. The net recurring savings for the recommendation to develop joint bases decreased by \$151.4 million. Some of the decreases in net annual recurring savings were offset by recommendations that had increases in net annual recurring savings. For example, the recommendation to consolidate the Defense Finance and Accounting Service had the largest increase in estimated net annual recurring savings of \$396.3 million. The larger than expected savings for this

---

<sup>25</sup> GAO, *Defense Infrastructure: DOD Needs to Periodically Review Support Standards and Costs at Joint Bases and Better Inform Congress of Facility Sustainment Funding Use*, GAO-09-336 (Washington, D.C.: Mar. 30, 2009).

<sup>26</sup> As we have previously reported, we and the BRAC Commission believe that DOD's net annual recurring savings estimates are overstated because they include savings from eliminating military personnel positions without corresponding decreases in end-strength. DOD disagrees with our position.

<sup>27</sup> The net annual recurring savings is calculated by deducting DOD estimates of the annual recurring costs from the annual recurring savings that are expected to accrue in 2012, the year after the BRAC 2005 recommendations have been completed and will be in a steady state.

recommendation resulted from the recommendation being completed earlier than scheduled, thus allowing savings to begin to accrue sooner. See enclosure V for a list of DOD's estimated annual recurring savings from all BRAC 2005 recommendations, and enclosure VI for the differences between the BRAC Commission estimates and DOD's fiscal year 2011 budget estimates for each recommendation.

### **Concluding Observations**

Notwithstanding the \$14.1 billion increase in one-time implementation costs of the 2005 BRAC round, which in turn decreased the amount of 20-year net savings DOD expected to achieve by 72 percent compared to the BRAC Commission's estimates, OSD officials told us that the department still expects that implementing BRAC 2005 recommendations will enhance military value, defense operations, and defense management. We are continuing to analyze the BRAC 2005 implementation and plan to issue a report later this year on lessons learned that could be applied to any future BRAC round.

---

### **Agency Comments**

We provided a draft copy of this report to DOD for review and comment. In response, DOD stated that our draft accurately describes changes in estimated costs and savings from the reported Commission estimates to the Department's final cost and savings data. In addition, DOD noted that it continues to believe that the BRAC process is the only fair, objective, and proven process for closing and realigning bases in the United States. DOD also provided technical comments, which we incorporated as appropriate. DOD's written comments are reprinted in enclosure VII.

---

We are sending copies of this report to interested congressional committees; the Secretary of Defense; the secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force; the Commandant of the Marine Corps; the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Installations and Environment) and the Director, Office of Management and Budget. In addition, the report will be available at no charge on GAO's website at <http://www.gao.gov>.

If you or your staff have any questions concerning this report, please contact me at (202) 512-4523 or by e-mail at [leporeb@gao.gov](mailto:leporeb@gao.gov). Contact points for our Offices of Congressional Relations and Public Affairs are on the last page of this report. GAO staff who made major contributions to this report include Laura Talbott, Assistant Director; Vijay Barnabas; John Beauchamp; John Clary; Susan Ditto; Brandon Jones; Gregory Marchand; Charles Perdue; Pauline Reaves; John Trubey; and Erik Wilkins-McKee.



Brian J. Lepore,  
Director  
Defense Capabilities and Management

## Enclosure I: DOD's Estimated Costs to Implement All Recommendations from the 2005 BRAC Round

**Table 4: DOD's Estimated Cost to Implement BRAC 2005 Recommendations Sorted by Highest to Lowest Cost, fiscal years 2006 through 2011**

(Current-year dollars in millions)	
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>One-time cost</b>
Realign Operational Army (Integrated Global Presence and Basing Strategy)	\$2,933.0
Realign Walter Reed Army Medical Center to Bethesda National Naval Medical Center, MD, and to Fort Belvoir, VA	2,720.4
Close National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency leased locations and realign others at Fort Belvoir, VA	2,553.3
Establish San Antonio Regional Medical Center and realign enlisted medical training to Fort Sam Houston, TX	1,993.9
Close Fort Monmouth, NJ	1,866.4
Realign Maneuver Training to Fort Benning, GA	1,688.2
Co-locate miscellaneous OSD, defense agency, and field activity leased locations	1,428.3
Realign to establish Combat Service Support Center at Fort Lee, VA	1,419.9
Close Fort McPherson, GA	804.8
Realign Fort Hood, TX	620.5
Close Brooks City-Base, TX	608.2
Consolidate Defense Information Systems Agency at Fort Meade, MD	601.8
Relocate Army headquarters and field operating activities	578.4
Realign supply, storage, and distribution management	539.5
Co-locate military department investigation agencies with DOD Counterintelligence and Security Agency at Marine Corps Base Quantico, VA	472.5
Reserve Component Transformation, TX	470.3
Realign to create a Naval Integrated Weapons and Armaments Research, Development, and Acquisition, Test and Evaluation Center mostly at Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake, CA	456.6
Consolidate depot-level reparable procurement management	432.0
Co-locate missile and space defense agencies at Redstone Arsenal, AL	386.8
Consolidate/co-locate active and reserve personnel and recruiting centers for the Army and Air Force	381.6
Consolidate Defense Finance and Accounting Service	336.2
Realign Fort Bragg, NC	336.1
Close Naval Air Station Willow Grove, PA, and realign Cambria Regional Airport, Johnstown, PA	297.4
Realign to relocate Air Defense Artillery Center and School at Fort Sill, OK	289.7
Close Fort Monroe, VA	286.1
Close Naval Air Station Brunswick, ME	284.8
Reserve Component Transformation, OK	269.4
Realign defense research service-led laboratories at multiple locations	260.3
Realign to create joint centers of excellence for chemical, biological, and medical research and development and acquisition	258.3
Co-locate miscellaneous Air Force leased locations and National Guard Headquarters leased locations	254.6
Consolidate correctional facilities into joint regional correctional facilities	244.9
Realign Naval Support Activity, New Orleans, LA	239.8
Close Naval Station Ingleside, TX and realign Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, TX	209.5
Co-locate miscellaneous Army leased locations	201.8
Relocate miscellaneous Department of the Navy leased locations	201.5
Realign to relocate undergraduate pilot and navigator training	193.4
Realign to establish Joint Strike Fighter initial joint training site at Eglin Air Force Base, FL	189.4

Reserve Component Transformation, AR	185.1
Consolidate Transportation Command components at Scott Air Force Base, IL	178.8
Reserve Component Transformation, CA	164.8
Realign Army Reserve Command and Control - Northeast	155.9
Reserve Component Transformation, NY	147.1
Consolidate media organizations into a new agency for media and publications at Fort Meade, MD	142.6
Realign Red River Army Depot, TX	142.5
Close Fort Gillem, GA	140.0
Close Kulis Air Guard Station, AK	138.7
Reserve Component Transformation, PA	134.6
Relocate medical command headquarters	134.0
Realign Grand Forks Air Force Base, ND	129.5
Reserve Component Transformation, AL	129.1
Reserve Component Transformation, CT	127.1
Close Lone Star Army Ammunition Plant, TX	127.0
Realign to consolidate maritime command, control, communications, computers, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance; research, development, and acquisition; and test and evaluation functions at multiple locations	126.0
Close Riverbank Army Ammunition Plant, CA	125.7
Reserve Component Transformation, IA	120.0
Reserve Component Transformation, OH	115.7
Close Kansas Army Ammunition Plant, KS	113.3
Close Onizuka Air Force Station, CA	106.8
Realign Pope Air Force Base, NC	105.4
Consolidate civilian personnel offices within military department and defense agencies	103.8
Reserve Component Transformation, PR	96.9
Realign by converting medical inpatient services to clinics at various installations	95.7
Realign Defense Intelligence Agency functions	93.3
Consolidate Army Test and Evaluation Command Headquarters at Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD	93.0
Reserve Component Transformation, MA	92.7
Close Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Centers	91.7
Co-locate defense and military department adjudication activities	88.9
Realign Otis Air National Guard Base, MA, and Lambert-St. Louis International Airport Air Guard Station, MO	83.0
Reserve Component Transformation, WY	79.8
Realign Army Reserve Command and Control - Northwest	79.7
Realign to create an integrated weapons and armaments specialty site for guns and ammunition at Picatinny Arsenal, NJ	77.2
Reserve Component Transformation, WA	76.8
Realign to establish Joint Center of Excellence for culinary training at Fort Lee, VA	73.1
Realign to establish centers for rotary wing air platform Development, and Acquisition, Test and Evaluation Center at Patuxent River, MD, and Redstone Arsenal, AL	71.0
Close Galena Forward Operating Location, AK	69.5
Reserve Component Transformation, OR	68.9
Realign Mountain Home Air Force Base, ID	66.9
Reserve Component Transformation, WV	64.9
Close Naval Air Station Atlanta, GA	61.5
Reserve Component Transformation, IN	61.2
Reserve Component Transformation, LA	60.2
Reserve Component Transformation, IL	59.3
Reserve Component Transformation, AZ	56.1
Realign Naval Air Station New Orleans Air Reserve Station, LA	55.7
Establish joint bases at multiple locations	54.2

Realign to establish fleet readiness centers	53.2
Reserve Component Transformation, HI	52.0
Close Naval Facilities Engineering Field Division/Activity	50.2
Reserve Component Transformation, VT	49.0
Close Naval Weapons Station, Seal Beach, Concord, CA	47.7
Reserve Component Transformation, NE	45.9
Close Navy Supply Corps School Athens, GA	45.0
Realign Army Reserve Command and Control - New England	43.0
Realign Naval Station Newport, RI	39.0
Realign to relocate Army Prime Power School training at Fort Leonard Wood, MO	37.6
Reserve Component Transformation, MO	37.2
Reserve Component Transformation, KY	37.1
Realign Bradley International Airport Air Guard Station, CT	35.2
Realign Marine Corps Logistics Base Barstow, CA	34.8
Realign Hill Air Force Base, UT	34.3
Close Deseret Chemical Depot, UT	31.9
Consolidate Defense Commissary Agency Eastern and Midwestern Regions, and Hopewell, VA, offices	31.4
Realign Portland International Airport Air Guard Station, OR	30.6
Realign Andrews Air Force Base, MD	29.4
Realign to establish Joint Center for consolidated transportation management training at Fort Lee, VA	29.1
Reserve Component Transformation, DE	28.3
Reserve Component Transformation, MT	28.2
Reserve Component Transformation, NM	28.1
Establish Air Force logistics support centers	27.6
Realign Single Drill Sergeant School to Fort Jackson, SC	27.2
Realign Eielson Air Force Base, AK	26.7
Reserve Component Transformation, TN	26.4
Realign Naval Shipyard Detachments	26.2
Reserve Component Transformation, MN	25.3
Realign Nashville International Airport Air Guard Station, TN	24.9
Realign Beale Air Force Base, CA	23.4
Realign Cannon Air Force Base, NM	23.4
Reserve Component Transformation, NJ	23.3
Realign Sierra Army Depot, CA	23.3
Realign to establish centers for fixed wing air platform Research, Development, and Acquisition, Test and Evaluation Center at Wright- Patterson Air Force Base, OH, and Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake, CA	21.6
Realign Capital Airport Air Guard Station, IL	21.5
Realign Army Reserve Command and Control - Southwest	21.5
Realign Army Reserve Command and Control - Southeast	20.8
Realign Ship Intermediate Maintenance Activity Norfolk, VA	20.8
Reserve Component Transformation, GA	19.7
Close Naval Station Pascagoula, MS	18.8
Close General Mitchell Air Reserve Station, WI	18.3
Reserve Component Transformation, WI	17.5
Close Newport Chemical Depot, IN	15.3
Realign to establish Joint Center of Excellence for religious training and education at Fort Jackson, SC	14.9
Reserve Component Transformation, MD	14.4
Reserve Component Transformation, RI	14.4
Realign Fairchild Air Force Base, WA	14.2
Realign Richmond International Airport Air Guard Station, VA	14.1
Reserve Component Transformation, NC	13.9
Close W.K. Kellogg Airport Air Guard Station, MI	13.5
Close Umatilla Chemical Depot, OR	13.4

Realign Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station, NY	13.1
Realign March Air Reserve Base, CA	12.3
Realign Lackland Air Force Base, TX	12.2
Close Marine Corps Support Activity Kansas City, MO	12.0
Reserve Component Transformation, MI	11.6
Establish F100 engine centralized intermediate repair facilities	10.2
Realign Officer Training Command, Naval Air Station Pensacola, FL	10.1
Realign Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach, CA	9.7
Reserve Component Transformation, NH	9.6
Reserve Component Transformation, ND	9.0
Close Navy Reserve Centers	8.9
Realign Martin State Air Guard Station, MD	8.2
Realign Fort Smith Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, AR	7.4
Realign Key Field Air Guard Station, MS	7.1
Realign Great Falls International Airport Air Guard Station, MT	6.6
Realign Ellington Field Air Guard Station, TX	6.1
Realign Mansfield-Lahm Air Guard Station, OH	5.8
Realign Robins Air Force Base, GA	5.7
Close Mississippi Army Ammunition Plant, MS	5.5
Realign commodity management privatization	4.9
Realign Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, OH	4.6
Close U.S. Army Garrison Michigan at Selfridge	4.6
Relocate Air Force Real Property Agency	4.2
Realign Rock Island Arsenal, IL	3.9
Realign to create an air integrated weapons and armaments Research, Development, and Acquisition, Test and Evaluation Center at Eglin Air Force Base, FL	3.3
Realign Boise Air Terminal Air Guard Station, ID	3.3
Realign Hector International Airport Air Guard Station, ND	3.2
Realign Navy Reserve Readiness Commands	1.8
Realign Naval Submarine Base New London, CT	1.6
Realign Navy Regions	1.2
Close Navy Recruiting Districts	0.8
Realign to consolidate ground vehicle Development, and Acquisition in a joint center at Detroit Arsenal, MI	0.8
Realign Langley Air Force Base, VA, by establishing a centralized intermediate repair facility – F-15 Avionics at Tyndall Air Force Base, FL	0.6
Realign to consolidate sea vehicle Development, and Acquisition to Naval Surface Warfare Center Carderock Division, MD, and Naval Sea Systems Command, DC	0.0
Create joint mobilization sites	0.0
Realign Fort Wainwright, AK	0.0
Realign Watervliet Arsenal, NY	0.0
Realign medical functions at McChord Air Force Base, WA	0.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$35,151.7<sup>a</sup></b>

Source: GAO analysis based on DOD's fiscal year 2011 BRAC budget data.

Note: Totals may not equal the sum due to rounding.

<sup>a</sup>Total includes \$1.2 billion for BRAC program administration costs because DOD included this amount in the BRAC budget. However, we did not list it in this table because it is not a recommendation.

## Enclosure II: Dollar Differences in One-time Costs from BRAC Commission Estimates to Fiscal Year 2011 DOD Budget

**Table 5: Dollar Differences in One-Time Costs From BRAC Commission Estimates to Fiscal Year 2011 DOD Budget**

(Current-year dollars in millions).			
Recommendation	2005 BRAC Commission estimate	Fiscal year 2011 DOD budget	Dollar difference
Realign Walter Reed Army Medical Center to Bethesda National Naval Medical Center, MD, and to Fort Belvoir, VA	\$988.8	\$2,720.4	\$1,731.6
Close National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency leased locations and realign others at Fort Belvoir, VA	1,117.3	2,553.3	1,436.0
Close Fort Monmouth, NJ	780.4	1,866.4	1,086.0
Establish San Antonio Regional Medical Center and realign enlisted medical training to Fort Sam Houston, TX	1,040.9	1,993.9	953.0
Realign Maneuver Training to Fort Benning, GA	773.1	1,688.2	915.1
Co-locate miscellaneous OSD, defense agency, and field activity leased locations	601.8	1,428.3	826.6
Realign to establish Combat Service Support Center at Fort Lee, VA	754.0	1,419.9	665.9
Close Fort McPherson, GA	214.5	804.8	590.2
Consolidate Defense Information Systems Agency at Fort Meade, MD	220.0	601.8	381.9
Relocate Army headquarters and field operating activities	199.9	578.4	378.5
Realign supply, storage, and distribution management	192.7	539.5	346.8
Consolidate depot-level reparable procurement management	124.9	432.0	307.1
Co-locate military department investigation agencies with DOD Counterintelligence and Security Agency at Marine Corps Base Quantico, VA	172.0	472.5	300.5
Close Brooks City-Base, TX	325.3	608.2	282.9
Consolidate/co-locate active and reserve personnel and recruiting centers for the Army and Air Force	128.7	381.6	252.8
Close Fort Monroe, VA	72.4	286.1	213.7
Co-locate missile and space defense agencies at Redstone Arsenal, AL	178.2	386.8	208.6
Realign to create joint centers of excellence for chemical, biological, and medical research and development and acquisition	55.2	258.3	203.1
Realign Naval Support Activity, New Orleans, LA	46.2	239.8	193.6
Realign Fort Hood, TX	435.8	620.5	184.7
Co-locate miscellaneous Air Force leased locations and National Guard Headquarters leased locations	90.5	254.6	164.1
Co-locate miscellaneous Army leased locations	44.1	201.8	157.7
Relocate miscellaneous Department of the Navy leased locations	61.8	201.5	139.8
Realign defense research service-led laboratories at multiple locations	136.1	260.3	124.3
Realign to relocate undergraduate pilot and navigator training	71.7	193.4	121.7
Realign to create a Naval Integrated Weapons and Armaments Research, Development, and Acquisition, Test and Evaluation Center mostly at Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake, CA	343.3	456.6	113.2
Reserve Component Transformation, OK	168.7	269.4	100.7



Consolidate media organizations into a new agency for media and publications at Fort Meade, MD	42.0	142.6	100.6
Close Riverbank Army Ammunition Plant, CA	25.2	125.7	100.5
Close Lone Star Army Ammunition Plant, TX	29.0	127.0	98.0
Reserve Component Transformation, TX	375.6	470.3	94.7
Close Naval Air Station Brunswick, ME	193.1	284.8	91.6
Close Kansas Army Ammunition Plant, KS	25.2	113.3	88.1
Reserve Component Transformation, CA	78.7	164.8	86.1
Consolidate Army Test and Evaluation Command Headquarters at Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD	7.1	93.0	85.9
Close Fort Gillem, GA	56.8	140.0	83.2
Consolidate Defense Finance and Accounting Service	254.4	336.2	81.8
Consolidate Transportation Command components at Scott Air Force Base, IL	101.9	178.8	77.0
Consolidate correctional facilities into joint regional correctional facilities	171.3	244.9	73.5
Realign to establish Joint Center of Excellence for culinary training at Fort Lee, VA	5.4	73.1	67.8
Reserve Component Transformation, AR	118.9	185.1	66.2
Close Galena Forward Operating Location, AK	11.5	69.5	58.0
Close Naval Air Station Willow Grove, PA, and realign Cambria Regional Airport, Johnstown, PA	239.5	297.4	57.9
Reserve Component Transformation, IA	68.9	120.0	51.1
Reserve Component Transformation, OR	24.1	68.9	44.8
Reserve Component Transformation, NY	103.8	147.1	43.3
Realign to relocate Air Defense Artillery Center and School at Fort Sill, OK	247.0	289.7	42.7
Realign to consolidate maritime command, control, communications, computers, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance; research, development, and acquisition; and test and evaluation functions at multiple locations	86.6	126.0	39.4
Reserve Component Transformation, WV	29.5	64.9	35.4
Close Naval Weapons Station, Seal Beach, Concord, CA	14.0	47.7	33.7
Close Naval Station Ingleside, TX and realign Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, TX	177.1	209.5	32.4
Realign to relocate Army Prime Power School training at Fort Leonard Wood, MO	6.0	37.6	31.6
Reserve Component Transformation, LA	30.7	60.2	29.5
Close Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Centers	62.4	91.7	29.3
Realign Otis Air National Guard Base, MA, and Lambert-St. Louis International Airport Air Guard Station, MO	53.7	83.0	29.3
Relocate medical command headquarters	106.3	134.0	27.8
Realign to establish Joint Center for consolidated transportation management training at Fort Lee, VA	1.5	29.1	27.6
Realign Naval Station Newport, RI	11.8	39.0	27.2
Realign Single Drill Sergeant School to Fort Jackson, SC	1.8	27.2	25.4
Realign Grand Forks Air Force Base, ND	104.2	129.5	25.3
Reserve Component Transformation, AZ	31.1	56.1	25.0
Co-locate defense and military department adjudication activities	67.1	88.9	21.8
Realign to establish centers for rotary wing air platform Development, and Acquisition, Test and Evaluation Center at Patuxent River, MD, and Redstone Arsenal, AL	49.4	71.0	21.6
Close Navy Supply Corps School Athens, GA	23.8	45.0	21.2
Close Naval Air Station Atlanta, GA	40.4	61.5	21.0
Realign Bradley International Airport Air Guard Station, CT	14.3	35.2	20.9

Reserve Component Transformation, AL	109.2	129.1	19.9
Realign to establish fleet readiness centers	33.5	53.2	19.7
Close General Mitchell Air Reserve Station, WI	0.0	18.3	18.3
Establish Air Force logistics support centers	9.3	27.6	18.3
Reserve Component Transformation, IL	42.6	59.3	16.7
Consolidate civilian personnel offices within military department and defense agencies	87.1	103.8	16.6
Reserve Component Transformation, WA	61.2	76.8	15.6
Reserve Component Transformation, DE	13.6	28.3	14.7
Realign to establish Joint Center of Excellence for religious training and education at Fort Jackson, SC	1.0	14.9	13.9
Realign Naval Shipyard Detachments	12.5	26.2	13.7
Close Deseret Chemical Depot, UT	18.3	31.9	13.6
Reserve Component Transformation, IN	47.6	61.2	13.6
Close Newport Chemical Depot, IN	2.3	15.3	13.0
Reserve Component Transformation, NE	33.1	45.9	12.8
Close Naval Facilities Engineering Field Division/Activity	37.9	50.2	12.3
Reserve Component Transformation, KY	25.3	37.1	11.8
Realign to create an integrated weapons and armaments specialty site for guns and ammunition at Picatinny Arsenal, NJ	66.8	77.2	10.4
Realign Ship Intermediate Maintenance Activity Norfolk, VA	10.6	20.8	10.2
Reserve Component Transformation, NM	17.9	28.1	10.2
Realign Andrews Air Force Base, MD	19.4	29.4	10.1
Reserve Component Transformation, PR	87.0	96.9	9.9
Realign Marine Corps Logistics Base Barstow, CA	26.0	34.8	8.8
Reserve Component Transformation, MO	28.6	37.2	8.6
Realign Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station, NY	4.8	13.1	8.3
Reserve Component Transformation, NJ	15.1	23.3	8.2
Reserve Component Transformation, MD	6.3	14.4	8.1
Reserve Component Transformation, MN	17.3	25.3	8.0
Realign Fairchild Air Force Base, WA	6.4	14.2	7.8
Reserve Component Transformation, WY	72.4	79.8	7.4
Reserve Component Transformation, MA	85.5	92.7	7.2
Realign March Air Reserve Base, CA	5.2	12.3	7.1
Reserve Component Transformation, WI	10.7	17.5	6.8
Close Navy Reserve Centers	2.6	8.9	6.4
Realign Officer Training Command, Naval Air Station Pensacola, FL	4.1	10.1	6.0
Realign Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach, CA	4.0	9.7	5.7
Realign Hill Air Force Base, UT	28.6	34.3	5.7
Close W.K. Kellogg Airport Air Guard Station, MI	8.3	13.5	5.2
Reserve Component Transformation, NC	9.2	13.9	4.7
Realign Ellington Field Air Guard Station, TX	2.0	6.1	4.2
Realign Lackland Air Force Base, TX	8.1	12.2	4.1
Realign to establish centers for fixed wing air platform Research, Development, and Acquisition, Test and Evaluation Center at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH, and Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake, CA	17.7	21.6	3.9
Close Marine Corps Support Activity Kansas City, MO	8.2	12.0	3.8
Reserve Component Transformation, MI	7.9	11.6	3.7
Establish joint bases at multiple locations	50.6	54.2	3.6
Reserve Component Transformation, MT	26.0	28.2	2.2
Realign Hector International Airport Air Guard Station, ND	1.8	3.2	1.4
Realign Fort Bragg, NC	334.8	336.1	1.3

Reserve Component Transformation, ND	7.9	9.0	1.1
Establish F100 engine centralized intermediate repair facilities	9.2	10.2	1.0
Close Naval Station Pascagoula, MS	17.9	18.8	0.9
Realign to create an air integrated weapons and armaments Research, Development, and Acquisition, Test and Evaluation Center at Eglin Air Force Base, FL	2.7	3.3	0.6
Realign Fort Wainwright, AK	0.1	0.0	(0.1)
Create joint mobilization sites	0.1	0.0	(0.1)
Close Umatilla Chemical Depot, OR	13.6	13.4	(0.2)
Realign Naval Air Station New Orleans Air Reserve Station, LA	55.9	55.7	(0.2)
Realign Great Falls International Airport Air Guard Station, MT	6.8	6.6	(0.2)
Relocate Air Force Real Property Agency	4.5	4.2	(0.3)
Consolidate Defense Commissary Agency Eastern and Midwestern Regions, and Hopewell, VA, offices	31.7	31.4	(0.3)
Realign Robins Air Force Base, GA	6.2	5.7	(0.5)
Realign Army Reserve Command and Control - Northwest	80.4	79.7	(0.7)
Realign Navy Reserve Readiness Commands	2.6	1.8	(0.8)
Realign medical functions at McChord Air Force Base, WA	1.1	0.0	(1.1)
Realign Langley Air Force Base, VA, by establishing a centralized intermediate repair facility – F-15 Avionics at Tyndall Air Force Base, FL	1.8	0.6	(1.2)
Realign Capital Airport Air Guard Station, IL	22.8	21.5	(1.2)
Reserve Component Transformation, CT	128.6	127.1	(1.5)
Realign to consolidate sea vehicle Development, and Acquisition to Naval Surface Warfare Center Carderock Division, MD, and Naval Sea Systems Command, DC	1.5	0.0	(1.5)
Realign commodity management privatization	6.4	4.9	(1.6)
Close Navy Recruiting Districts	2.4	0.8	(1.6)
Reserve Component Transformation, GA	21.4	19.7	(1.7)
Realign Navy Regions	3.2	1.2	(2.0)
Realign Mansfield-Lahm Air Guard Station, OH	8.6	5.8	(2.7)
Realign to consolidate ground vehicle Development, and Acquisition in a joint center at Detroit Arsenal, MI	3.8	0.8	(3.0)
Realign Defense Intelligence Agency functions	96.7	93.3	(3.4)
Realign Key Field Air Guard Station, MS	10.7	7.1	(3.6)
Realign Naval Submarine Base, New London, CT	5.5	1.6	(3.9)
Reserve Component Transformation, HI	56.6	52.0	(4.6)
Close U.S. Army Garrison Michigan at Selfridge	9.5	4.6	(4.9)
Realign Fort Smith Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, AR	13.5	7.4	(6.1)
Realign Eielson Air Force Base, AK	32.9	26.7	(6.2)
Realign Richmond International Airport Air Guard Station, VA	22.0	14.1	(7.9)
Reserve Component Transformation, PA	142.7	134.6	(8.1)
Realign Red River Army Depot, TX	150.9	142.5	(8.4)
Close Kulis Air Guard Station, AK	147.4	138.7	(8.6)
Realign Army Reserve Command and Control - Southeast	29.9	20.8	(9.1)
Realign to establish Joint Strike Fighter initial joint training site at Eglin Air Force Base, FL	199.1	189.4	(9.7)
Realign Sierra Army Depot, CA	33.4	23.3	(10.1)
Reserve Component Transformation, TN	36.9	26.4	(10.5)
Reserve Component Transformation, VT	61.4	49.0	(12.4)

Realign Boise Air Terminal Air Guard Station, ID	16.7	3.3	(13.5)
Realign Army Reserve Command and Control - Northeast	171.2	155.9	(15.3)
Realign Martin State Air Guard Station, MD	24.0	8.2	(15.8)
Close Onizuka Air Force Station, CA	123.7	106.8	(17.0)
Realign Beale Air Force Base, CA	40.6	23.4	(17.2)
Reserve Component Transformation, RI	32.4	14.4	(18.0)
Reserve Component Transformation, OH	134.8	115.7	(19.1)
Realign Rock Island Arsenal, IL	27.0	3.9	(23.1)
Realign Nashville International Airport Air Guard Station, TN	48.7	24.9	(23.8)
Realign Mountain Home Air Force Base, ID	91.4	66.9	(24.5)
Realign Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, OH	30.8	4.6	(26.2)
Close Mississippi Army Ammunition Plant, MS	32.4	5.5	(26.9)
Realign Army Reserve Command and Control - Southwest	55.5	21.5	(34.0)
Realign Portland International Airport Air Guard Station, OR	70.0	30.6	(39.4)
Reserve Component Transformation, NH	54.2	9.6	(44.6)
Realign by converting medical inpatient services to clinics at various installations	141.3	95.7	(45.6)
Realign Army Reserve Command and Control - New England	96.1	43.0	(53.1)
Realign Watervliet Arsenal, NY	63.7	0.0	(63.7)
Realign Cannon Air Force Base, NM	108.2	23.4	(84.8)
Realign Pope Air Force Base, NC	191.3	105.4	(85.9)
Realign Operational Army (Integrated Global Presence and Basing Strategy)	3,946.0	2,933.0	(1,013.0)
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$20,947.4</b>	<b>\$35,151.7<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>\$14,204.3</b>

Source: GAO analysis of 2005 BRAC Commission data and DOD's fiscal year 2011 BRAC budget data.

Note: Totals may not equal the sum of the numbers in each column, due to rounding.

<sup>a</sup>Total includes \$1.2 billion for BRAC program administration costs.

## Enclosure III: DOD's Estimated 20-Year Net Present Value Data for All BRAC 2005 Recommendations

**Table 6: DOD's Estimated 20-Year Net Present Value Data For BRAC Recommendations Sorted by Lowest to Highest Savings (Fiscal Years 2006 through 2025)**

(Constant fiscal year 2005 dollars in millions)

<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Net present value (negative value indicates net costs while positive value indicates net savings)</b>
Realign Operational Army (Integrated Global Presence and Basing Strategy)	(\$5,795.9)
Realign Fort Hood, TX	(1,652.9)
Close National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency leased locations and realign others at Fort Belvoir, VA	(1,563.0)
Co-locate miscellaneous OSD, defense agency, and field activity leased locations	(1,085.6)
Realign Fort Bragg, NC	(674.1)
Establish San Antonio Regional Medical Center and realign enlisted medical training to Fort Sam Houston, TX	(628.2)
Realign Walter Reed Army Medical Center to Bethesda National Naval Medical Center, MD, and to Fort Belvoir, VA	(595.1)
Realign Martin State Air Guard Station, MD	(421.8)
Co-locate military department investigation agencies with DOD Counterintelligence and Security Agency at Marine Corps Base Quantico, VA	(343.2)
Realign to establish Joint Strike Fighter initial joint training site at Eglin Air Force Base, FL	(285.8)
Relocate Army headquarters and field operating activities	(257.0)
Co-locate miscellaneous Air Force leased locations and National Guard Headquarters leased locations	(198.4)
Consolidate correctional facilities into joint regional correctional facilities	(185.3)
Realign to create joint centers of excellence for chemical, biological, and medical research and development and acquisition	(157.0)
Realign Great Falls International Airport Air Guard Station, MT	(151.9)
Realign Otis Air National Guard Base, MA, and Lambert-St. Louis International Airport Air Guard Station, MO	(136.2)
Realign Maneuver Training to Fort Benning, GA	(124.3)
Relocate miscellaneous Department of the Navy leased locations	(112.9)
Relocate medical command headquarters	(105.9)
Reserve Component Transformation, AR	(91.2)
Realign March Air Reserve Base, CA	(84.2)
Consolidate media organizations into a new agency for media and publications at Fort Meade, MD	(83.3)
Reserve Component Transformation, NY	(83.0)
Consolidate Defense Information Systems Agency at Fort Meade, MD	(70.4)
Reserve Component Transformation, MA	(63.6)
Co-locate defense and military department adjudication activities	(58.7)
Reserve Component Transformation, OR	(54.2)
Realign to create an integrated weapons and armaments specialty site for guns and ammunition at Picatinny Arsenal, NJ	(53.4)
Realign Naval Station Newport, RI	(47.3)
Realign Nashville International Airport Air Guard Station, TN	(47.1)
Reserve Component Transformation, OK	(46.9)
Realign to relocate undergraduate pilot and navigator training	(46.8)
Realign to establish Joint Center of Excellence for culinary training at Fort Lee, VA	(44.7)
Realign to establish centers for rotary wing air platform Development and Acquisition, Test and Evaluation Center, at Patuxent River, MD, and Redstone Arsenal, AL	(41.1)

Reserve Component Transformation, CA	(40.0)
Close Riverbank Army Ammunition Plant, CA	(39.0)
Reserve Component Transformation, CT	(38.8)
Realign Bradley International Airport Air Guard Station, CT	(33.0)
Realign Defense Intelligence Agency functions	(31.0)
Realign Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station, NY	(29.5)
Reserve Component Transformation, VT	(26.0)
Realign to relocate Army Prime Power School training at Fort Leonard Wood, MO	(25.9)
Close Deseret Chemical Depot, UT	(24.6)
Reserve Component Transformation, IN	(24.5)
Reserve Component Transformation, MN	(21.3)
Realign to establish centers for fixed wing air platform Research, Development, and Acquisition, Test and Evaluation Center at Wright- Patterson Air Force Base, OH, and Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake, CA	(19.2)
Realign Capital Airport Air Guard Station, IL	(18.3)
Reserve Component Transformation, WY	(16.8)
Reserve Component Transformation, IL	(15.4)
Realign Andrews Air Force Base, MD	(14.5)
Close Newport Chemical Depot, IN	(11.9)
Realign Fairchild Air Force Base, WA	(11.5)
Close W.K. Kellogg Airport Air Guard Station, MI	(11.2)
Realign to establish Joint Center of Excellence for religious training and education at Fort Jackson, SC	(10.9)
Realign Naval Shipyard Detachments	(10.6)
Reserve Component Transformation, DE	(10.3)
Close Umatilla Chemical Depot, OR	(10.0)
Reserve Component Transformation, TX	(9.9)
Close Navy Supply Corps School Athens, GA	(8.0)
Reserve Component Transformation, ND	(7.4)
Reserve Component Transformation, OH	(7.2)
Realign to establish Joint Center for consolidated transportation management training at Fort Lee, VA	(7.1)
Realign Mansfield-Lahm Air Guard Station, OH	(6.4)
Realign Key Field Air Guard Station, MS	(5.9)
Realign to consolidate ground vehicle Development, and Acquisition in a joint center at Detroit Arsenal, MI	(5.0)
Reserve Component Transformation, MT	(4.9)
Relocate Air Force Real Property Agency	(4.4)
Reserve Component Transformation, PR	(4.4)
Realign Ellington Field Air Guard Station, TX	(4.1)
Realign Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, OH	(3.7)
Realign Hector International Airport Air Guard Station, ND	(3.0)
Realign Boise Air Terminal Air Guard Station, ID	(2.6)
Realign Ship Intermediate Maintenance Activity Norfolk, VA	(2.3)
Realign to create an air integrated weapons and armaments Research, Development, and Acquisition, Test and Evaluation Center at Eglin Air Force Base, FL	(1.4)
Realign Officer Training Command, Naval Air Station Pensacola, FL	(0.9)
Realign to consolidate sea vehicle Development, and Acquisition to Naval Surface Warfare Center Carderock Division, MD, and Naval Sea Systems Command, DC	0.0
Realign Single Drill Sergeant School to Fort Jackson, SC	0.6
Realign Fort Wainwright, AK	0.6
Realign Rock Island Arsenal, IL	2.2
Reserve Component Transformation, TN	4.0
Realign Army Reserve Command and Control - Southeast	6.5
Establish F100 engine centralized intermediate repair facilities	6.8
Reserve Component Transformation, MD	8.7

Realign Langley Air Force Base, VA by establishing a centralized intermediate repair facility – F-15 Avionics at Tyndall Air Force Base, FL	9.5
Realign Richmond International Airport Air Guard Station, VA	10.6
Reserve Component Transformation, NM	11.9
Create joint mobilization sites	12.7
Realign Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach, CA	13.8
Reserve Component Transformation, NJ	14.3
Reserve Component Transformation, MI	15.6
Realign Naval Submarine Base New London, CT	17.1
Close Kansas Army Ammunition Plant, KS	17.8
Close Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Centers	18.3
Reserve Component Transformation, KY	18.7
Reserve Component Transformation, NC	19.6
Realign Marine Corps Logistics Base Barstow, CA	20.7
Reserve Component Transformation, AZ	21.4
Close Marine Corps Support Activity Kansas City, MO	22.5
Realign Portland International Airport Air Guard Station, OR	22.9
Consolidate Army Test and Evaluation Command Headquarters at Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD	23.7
Reserve Component Transformation, WA	23.9
Reserve Component Transformation, WV	24.3
Close Kulis Air Guard Station, AK	24.4
Reserve Component Transformation, NH	26.7
Realign Lackland Air Force Base, TX	28.6
Reserve Component Transformation, NE	29.0
Reserve Component Transformation, MO	35.7
Reserve Component Transformation, RI	37.4
Reserve Component Transformation, PA	37.5
Realign Sierra Army Depot, CA	37.6
Realign Army Reserve Command and Control - Southwest	40.5
Realign Army Reserve Command and Control - New England	41.0
Realign Navy Regions	41.1
Reserve Component Transformation, GA	41.7
Realign Navy Reserve Readiness Commands	41.7
Close Fort Monmouth, NJ	42.2
Realign Hill Air Force Base, UT	43.8
Close Mississippi Army Ammunition Plant, MS	52.2
Establish Air Force logistics support centers	52.7
Reserve Component Transformation, HI	54.0
Realign Naval Air Station New Orleans Air Reserve Station, LA	55.5
Realign Naval Support Activity New Orleans, LA	59.0
Realign Watervliet Arsenal, NY	60.4
Realign Army Reserve Command and Control - Northwest	63.3
Close Lone Star Army Ammunition Plant, TX	69.2
Close Naval Facilities Engineering Field Division/Activity	79.9
Reserve Component Transformation, AL	83.5
Consolidate civilian personnel offices within military department and defense agencies	87.8
Realign Beale Air Force Base, CA	92.1
Reserve Component Transformation, LA	92.3
Consolidate Defense Commissary Agency Eastern and Midwestern Regions, and Hopewell, VA, offices	98.3
Reserve Component Transformation, WI	110.6
Close Galena Forward Operating Location, AK	111.3
Co-locate missile and space defense agencies at Redstone Arsenal, AL	118.2
Realign Fort Smith Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, AR	118.3
Reserve Component Transformation, IA	123.6

Close Navy Recruiting Districts	133.7
Realign Red River Army Depot, TX	147.4
Realign medical functions at McChord Air Force Base, WA	150.8
Close Onizuka Air Force Station, CA	152.4
Close Naval Weapons Station, Seal Beach, Concord, CA	154.0
Realign Eielson Air Force Base, AK	160.6
Realign supply, storage, and distribution management	161.7
Realign Grand Forks Air Force Base, ND	163.8
Realign Robins Air Force Base, GA	164.3
Close Naval Air Station Willow Grove, PA, and realign Cambria Regional Airport, Johnstown, PA	178.7
Co-locate miscellaneous Army leased locations	188.8
Close Navy Reserve Centers	192.4
Close General Mitchell Air Reserve Station, WI	193.5
Realign to relocate Air Defense Artillery Center and School at Fort Sill, OK	209.0
Close U.S. Army Garrison Michigan at Selfridge	210.3
Realign defense research service-led laboratories at multiple locations	216.9
Realign to establish Combat Service Support Center at Fort Lee, VA	226.9
Close Fort McPherson, GA	245.3
Establish joint bases at multiple locations	249.2
Realign to create a Naval Integrated Weapons and Armaments Research, Development, and Acquisition, Test and Evaluation Center mostly at Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake, CA	253.9
Close Fort Gillem, GA	254.1
Realign Mountain Home Air Force Base, ID	262.2
Realign commodity management privatization	270.0
Realign Army Reserve Command and Control - Northeast	272.6
Realign to consolidate maritime command, control, communications, computers, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance; research, development, and acquisition; and test and evaluation functions at multiple locations	283.8
Close Fort Monroe, VA	323.9
Close Naval Air Station Atlanta, GA	358.6
Close Brooks City-Base, TX	397.0
Close Naval Station Pascagoula, MS	459.9
Close Naval Station Ingleside, TX, and realign Naval Air Station Corpus Christi, TX	484.9
Consolidate depot-level reparable procurement management	703.8
Close Naval Air Station Brunswick, ME	727.3
Realign by converting medical inpatient services to clinics at various installations	840.1
Consolidate Transportation Command components at Scott Air Force Base, IL	906.6
Consolidate/co-locate active and reserve personnel and recruiting centers for the Army and Air Force	1,411.6
Realign Pope Air Force Base, NC	2,354.8
Realign Cannon Air Force Base, NM	2,799.2
Realign to establish fleet readiness centers	3,117.1
Consolidate Defense Finance and Accounting Service	4,384.9
<b>Total net present value</b>	<b>\$9,860.1<sup>a</sup></b>

Source: GAO analysis based on DOD's fiscal year 2011 BRAC budget data.

Note: Totals may not equal the sum due to rounding.

<sup>a</sup>Total includes a 20-year net cost of \$1 billion for BRAC program administration and overhead costs because DOD included this amount in the BRAC budget. However, we did not list it in this table because it is not a recommendation.



## Enclosure IV: Differences in 20-Year Net Present Value from BRAC Commission Estimates to Fiscal Year 2011 DOD Budget

**Table 7: Differences in 20-Year Net Present Value from BRAC Commission Estimates to Fiscal Year 2011 DOD Budget**

(Constant fiscal year 2005 dollars in millions)			
Recommendation	2005 BRAC Commission estimate	Fiscal year 2011 DOD budget <sup>a</sup>	Dollar difference (negative value indicates net costs while positive value indicates net savings)
Realign supply, storage, and distribution management	\$2,925.8	\$161.7	(\$2,764.1)
Close National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency leased locations and realign others at Fort Belvoir, VA	535.1	(1,563.0)	(2,098.1)
Establish joint bases at multiple locations	2,342.5	249.2	(2,093.3)
Realign Walter Reed Army Medical Center to Bethesda National Naval Medical Center, MD, and to Fort Belvoir, VA	830.6	(595.1)	(1,425.7)
Co-locate miscellaneous OSD, defense agency, and field activity leased locations	256.4	(1,085.6)	(1,342.0)
Consolidate depot-level reparable procurement management	1,857.8	703.8	(1,154.0)
Establish San Antonio Regional Medical Center and realign enlisted medical training to Fort Sam Houston, TX	476.2	(628.2)	(1,104.4)
Realign Maneuver Training to Fort Benning, GA	948.1	(124.3)	(1,072.4)
Close Fort Monmouth, NJ	1,093.4	42.2	(1,051.2)
Realign to establish Combat Service Support Center at Fort Lee, VA	934.2	226.9	(707.3)
Realign Fort Hood, TX	(980.4)	(1,652.9)	(672.5)
Close Fort McPherson, GA	878.7	245.3	(633.3)
Realign to establish fleet readiness centers	3,715.0	3,117.1	(597.9)
Close Naval Air Station Willow Grove, PA, and realign Cambria Regional Airport, Johnstown, PA	757.8	178.7	(579.1)
Consolidate Defense Information Systems Agency at Fort Meade, MD	491.2	(70.4)	(561.6)
Close Brooks City-Base, TX	940.7	397.0	(543.7)
Co-locate military department investigation agencies with DOD Counterintelligence and Security Agency at Marine Corps Base Quantico, VA	166.4	(343.2)	(509.5)
Co-locate miscellaneous Air Force leased locations and National Guard Headquarters leased locations	308.2	(198.4)	(506.6)
Realign Grand Forks Air Force Base, ND	637.1	163.8	(473.3)
Consolidate/co-locate active and reserve personnel and recruiting centers for the Army and Air Force	1,884.5	1,411.6	(473.0)
Realign commodity management privatization	735.9	270.0	(465.9)
Realign Otis Air National Guard Base, MA, and Lambert-St. Louis International Airport Air Guard Station, MO	305.4	(136.2)	(441.6)
Close Deseret Chemical Depot, UT	407.5	(24.6)	(432.1)
Relocate medical command headquarters	316.3	(105.9)	(422.1)
Consolidate Transportation Command components at Scott Air Force Base, IL	1,309.3	906.6	(402.7)
Relocate Army headquarters and field operating activities	122.9	(257.0)	(379.9)
Close Fort Monroe, VA	686.6	323.9	(362.7)
Close Umatilla Chemical Depot, OR	347.9	(10.0)	(357.8)

Realign Pope Air Force Base, NC	2,711.5	2,354.8	(356.7)
Realign Naval Support Activity New Orleans, LA	387.7	59.0	(328.7)
Realign by converting medical inpatient services to clinics at various installations	1,146.5	840.1	(306.4)
Relocate miscellaneous Department of the Navy leased locations	164.7	(112.9)	(277.6)
Co-locate missile and space defense agencies at Redstone Arsenal, AL	359.1	118.2	(240.9)
Realign to relocate undergraduate pilot and navigator training	174.2	(46.8)	(221.0)
Realign Marine Corps Logistics, Base Barstow, CA	230.6	20.7	(209.9)
Close Naval Station, Pascagoula, MS	665.7	459.9	(205.8)
Realign to create joint centers of excellence for chemical, biological, and medical research and development and acquisition	39.5	(157.0)	(196.6)
Consolidate correctional facilities into joint regional correctional facilities	11.2	(185.3)	(196.5)
Consolidate media organizations into a new agency for media and publications at Fort Meade, MD	89.0	(83.3)	(172.3)
Close Fort Gillem, GA	421.5	254.1	(167.4)
Realign defense research service-led laboratories at multiple locations	380.3	216.9	(163.4)
Realign Great Falls International Airport Air Guard Station, MT	(7.2)	(151.9)	(144.7)
Close Newport Chemical Depot, IN	132.6	(11.9)	(144.5)
Reserve Component Transformation, TX	133.2	(9.9)	(143.1)
Realign to consolidate maritime command, control, communications, computers, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance; research, development, and acquisition; and test and evaluation functions at multiple locations	420.9	283.8	(137.1)
Co-locate miscellaneous Army leased locations	322.0	188.8	(133.2)
Close Naval Station Ingleside, TX and realign Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, TX	614.2	484.9	(129.3)
Reserve Component Transformation, OK	63.8	(46.9)	(110.7)
Realign to relocate Air Defense Artillery Center and School at Fort Sill, OK	319.1	209.0	(110.1)
Realign Ship Intermediate Maintenance Activity, Norfolk, VA	104.3	(2.3)	(106.6)
Realign to create an integrated weapons and armaments specialty site for guns and ammunition at Picatinny Arsenal, NJ	51.8	(53.4)	(105.2)
Consolidate Army Test and Evaluation Command Headquarters at Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD	125.7	23.7	(102.0)
Realign to create a Naval Integrated Weapons and Armaments Research, Development, and Acquisition, Test and Evaluation Center, mostly at Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake, CA	349.5	253.9	(95.7)
Close Lone Star Army Ammunition Plant, TX	164.2	69.2	(95.0)
Consolidate civilian personnel offices within the military departments and defense agencies	180.5	87.8	(92.6)
Close Riverbank Army Ammunition Plant, CA	53.3	(39.0)	(92.3)
Realign March Air Reserve Base, CA	6.1	(84.2)	(90.3)
Close Naval Air Station Atlanta, GA	446.0	358.6	(87.3)
Realign Mansfield-Lahm Air Guard Station, OH	79.6	(6.4)	(86.0)
Reserve Component Transformation, CA	46.0	(40.0)	(86.0)
Realign Andrews Air Force Base, MD	70.0	(14.5)	(84.4)
Realign Defense Intelligence Agency functions	52.8	(31.0)	(83.8)
Close Kansas Army Ammunition Plant, KS	101.4	17.8	(83.6)

Close Navy Recruiting Districts	214.5	133.7	(80.8)
Reserve Component Transformation, IA	201.7	123.6	(78.1)
Close Naval Air Station Brunswick, ME	797.9	727.3	(70.6)
Co-locate defense and military department adjudication activities	11.3	(58.7)	(70.0)
Realign Martin State Air Guard Station, MD	(353.7)	(421.8)	(68.1)
Realign to establish Joint Center of Excellence for culinary training at Fort Lee, VA	15.7	(44.7)	(60.5)
Realign Boise Air Terminal Air Guard Station, ID	57.0	(2.6)	(59.6)
Realign to establish Joint Strike Fighter initial joint training site at Eglin Air Force Base, FL	(226.3)	(285.8)	(59.5)
Close Onizuka Air Force Station, CA	211.0	152.4	(58.6)
Close Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Centers	76.8	18.3	(58.5)
Reserve Component Transformation, AL	140.3	83.5	(56.8)
Reserve Component Transformation, LA	147.6	92.3	(55.3)
Close Galena Forward Operating Location, AK	165.5	111.3	(54.2)
Reserve Component Transformation, AR	(38.2)	(91.2)	(53.0)
Reserve Component Transformation, WV	77.0	24.3	(52.7)
Realign Bradley International Airport Air Guard Station, CT	17.8	(33.0)	(50.7)
Close U.S. Army Garrison Michigan at Selfridge	260.9	210.3	(50.6)
Realign Navy Reserve Readiness Commands	91.7	41.7	(50.0)
Realign Naval Station Newport, RI	2.1	(47.3)	(49.4)
Close Kulis Air Guard Station, AK	70.6	24.4	(46.3)
Close Naval Weapons Station, Seal Beach, Concord, CA	199.7	154.0	(45.7)
Close Marine Corps Support Activity, Kansas City, MO	67.0	22.5	(44.5)
Close Navy Reserve Centers	236.6	192.4	(44.2)
Realign Hill Air Force Base, UT	85.0	43.8	(41.2)
Realign Red River Army Depot, TX	187.7	147.4	(40.2)
Realign Naval Submarine Base New London, CT	55.5	17.1	(38.4)
Realign to establish centers for fixed wing air platform Research, Development, and Acquisition, Test and Evaluation Center at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH, and Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake, CA	17.9	(19.2)	(37.1)
Reserve Component Transformation, NY	(46.5)	(83.0)	(36.5)
Realign Fort Bragg, NC	(639.2)	(674.1)	(34.9)
Reserve Component Transformation, OR	(19.8)	(54.2)	(34.4)
Realign Naval Shipyard Detachments	20.7	(10.6)	(31.3)
Realign Single Drill Sergeant School to Fort Jackson, SC	31.4	0.6	(30.8)
Reserve Component Transformation, AZ	51.7	21.4	(30.3)
Realign Army Reserve Command and Control - Northeast	302.1	272.6	(29.5)
Realign to establish centers for rotary wing air platform Development, and Acquisition, Test and Evaluation Center at Patuxent River, MD, and Redstone Arsenal, AL	(11.8)	(41.1)	(29.3)
Realign Sierra Army Depot, CA	66.7	37.6	(29.1)
Reserve Component Transformation, WI	139.7	110.6	(29.1)
Realign Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station, NY	(1.2)	(29.5)	(28.3)
Realign to relocate Army Prime Power School training at Fort Leonard Wood, MO	0.8	(25.9)	(26.7)
Reserve Component Transformation, MO	61.0	35.7	(25.3)
Create joint mobilization sites	37.9	12.7	(25.2)
Realign to establish Joint Center for consolidated transportation management training at Fort Lee, VA	18.0	(7.1)	(25.1)
Reserve Component Transformation, NE	53.7	29.0	(24.7)
Establish Air Force logistics support centers	77.0	52.7	(24.4)

Realign to establish Joint Center of Excellence for religious training and education at Fort Jackson, SC	11.9	(10.9)	(22.8)
Close W.K. Kellogg Airport Air Guard Station, MI	11.2	(11.2)	(22.3)
Reserve Component Transformation, WA	46.1	23.9	(22.2)
Realign to consolidate ground vehicle Development, and Acquisition in a joint center at Detroit Arsenal, MI	17.1	(5.0)	(22.1)
Reserve Component Transformation, IL	6.5	(15.4)	(21.9)
Reserve Component Transformation, PA	58.4	37.5	(20.9)
Realign Capital Airport Air Guard Station, IL	1.6	(18.3)	(19.9)
Realign to create an air integrated weapons and armaments Research, Development, and Acquisition, Test and Evaluation Center at Eglin Air Force Base, FL	17.9	(1.4)	(19.3)
Reserve Component Transformation, IN	(6.1)	(24.5)	(18.4)
Realign Fairchild Air Force Base, WA	6.7	(11.5)	(18.2)
Realign Hector International Airport Air Guard Station, ND	12.9	(3.0)	(15.9)
Reserve Component Transformation, KY	34.1	18.7	(15.4)
Realign medical functions at McChord Air Force Base, WA	164.4	150.8	(13.6)
Reserve Component Transformation, PR	8.6	(4.4)	(13.0)
Reserve Component Transformation, NM	24.6	11.9	(12.7)
Relocate Air Force Real Property Agency	7.9	(4.4)	(12.3)
Reserve Component Transformation, NJ	26.6	14.3	(12.3)
Realign Rock Island Arsenal, IL	13.8	2.2	(11.6)
Reserve Component Transformation, NC	30.2	19.6	(10.6)
Reserve Component Transformation, DE	(0.9)	(10.3)	(9.4)
Reserve Component Transformation, MD	17.8	8.7	(9.1)
Realign Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, OH	5.4	(3.7)	(9.1)
Realign Key Field Air Guard Station, MS	2.6	(5.9)	(8.5)
Realign Officer Training Command, Naval Air Station Pensacola, FL	7.6	(0.9)	(8.5)
Reserve Component Transformation, HI	62.4	54.0	(8.4)
Realign Richmond International Airport Air Guard Station, VA	18.7	10.6	(8.1)
Reserve Component Transformation, WY	(9.0)	(16.8)	(7.8)
Realign Robins Air Force Base, GA	171.7	164.3	(7.4)
Realign Ellington Field Air Guard Station, TX	2.7	(4.1)	(6.8)
Close Navy Supply Corps School Athens, GA	(1.4)	(8.0)	(6.7)
Realign Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach, CA	19.9	13.8	(6.1)
Reserve Component Transformation, MI	21.6	15.6	(6.0)
Reserve Component Transformation, OH	(1.3)	(7.2)	(5.9)
Reserve Component Transformation, MN	(17.1)	(21.3)	(4.2)
Realign Lackland Air Force Base, TX	32.4	28.6	(3.8)
Reserve Component Transformation, MA	(60.4)	(63.6)	(3.2)
Reserve Component Transformation, GA	44.8	41.7	(3.1)
Realign to consolidate sea vehicle Development and Acquisition to Naval Surface Warfare Center Carderock Division, MD, and Naval Sea Systems Command, DC	2.0	(0.0)	(2.0)
Close Naval Facilities Engineering Field Division/Activity	81.8	79.9	(1.9)
Realign Army Reserve Command and Control - Northwest	65.0	63.3	(1.7)
Reserve Component Transformation, MT	(4.3)	(4.9)	(0.6)
Establish F100 engine centralized intermediate repair facilities	7.2	6.8	(0.4)
Realign Fort Wainwright, AK	0.7	0.6	(0.1)
Reserve Component Transformation, ND	(8.0)	(7.4)	0.6

Realign Langley Air Force Base, VA, by establishing a centralized intermediate repair facility – F-15 Avionics at Tyndall Air Force Base, FL	8.5	9.5	1.0
Reserve Component Transformation, RI	35.3	37.4	2.1
Realign Army Reserve Command and Control - Southeast	1.5	6.5	5.0
Reserve Component Transformation, TN	(1.1)	4.0	5.1
Realign Navy Regions	34.6	41.1	6.5
Reserve Component Transformation, CT	(47.5)	(38.8)	8.7
Close Mississippi Army Ammunition Plant, MS	38.6	52.2	13.6
Realign Naval Air Station New Orleans Air Reserve Station, LA	41.5	55.5	13.9
Reserve Component Transformation, VT	(41.7)	(26.0)	15.7
Realign Army Reserve Command and Control - New England	21.8	41.0	19.2
Realign Eielson Air Force Base, AK	126.9	160.6	33.7
Reserve Component Transformation, NH	(12.9)	26.7	39.6
Realign Portland International Airport Air Guard Station, OR	(19.9)	22.9	42.9
Consolidate Defense Commissary Agency Eastern and Midwestern Regions, and Hopewell, VA, offices	53.3	98.3	45.0
Realign Army Reserve Command and Control - Southwest	(9.8)	40.5	50.3
Realign Watervliet Arsenal, NY	5.2	60.4	55.2
Realign Mountain Home Air Force Base, ID	189.3	262.2	72.9
Realign Fort Smith Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, AR	(7.9)	118.3	126.2
Realign Beale Air Force Base, CA	(57.9)	92.1	150.0
Realign Cannon Air Force Base, NM	2,647.5	2,799.2	151.8
Close General Mitchell Air Reserve Station, WI	0.0	193.5	193.5
Realign Nashville International Airport Air Guard Station, TN	(261.3)	(47.1)	214.2
Realign Operational Army (Integrated Global Presence and Basing Strategy)	(7,846.7)	(5,795.9)	2,050.8
Consolidate Defense Finance and Accounting Service	1,030.4	4,384.9	3,354.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$35,659.1</b>	<b>\$9,860.1<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>(\$25,799.0)</b>

Source: GAO analysis of 2005 BRAC Commission data and DOD's fiscal year 2011 BRAC budget data.

Note: Negative numbers in parenthesis are costs. Totals may not equal the sum of the numbers in each column, due to rounding. In addition, a recommendation added by the Commission to close the Navy Broadway Complex in San Diego, California was not included in DOD's budget books for BRAC 2005 as the property was sold prior to BRAC implementation.

<sup>a</sup>Fiscal year 2011 dollars were converted to constant 2005 dollars.

<sup>b</sup>Total includes a 20-year net cost of \$1 billion for BRAC program administration and overhead costs.

## Enclosure V: DOD's Estimated Annual Net Recurring Savings for All BRAC 2005 Recommendations

**Table 8: DOD's Estimated Net Annual Recurring Savings From Implementing BRAC 2005 Recommendations Sorted by Highest to Lowest Savings**

(Current-year dollars in millions)	
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Net annual recurring savings<sup>a</sup></b>
Consolidate Defense Finance and Accounting Service	\$498.9
Realign to establish fleet readiness centers	278.4
Realign Cannon Air Force Base, NM <sup>b</sup>	260.0
Realign Pope Air Force Base, NC	212.5
Realign Walter Reed Army Medical Center to Bethesda National Naval Medical Center, MD, and to Fort Belvoir, VA	172.1
Consolidate/co-locate active and reserve personnel and recruiting centers for Army and Air Force	169.6
Close Fort Monmouth, NJ	153.7
Realign to establish Combat Service Support Center at Fort Lee, VA	148.4
Realign Maneuver Training to Fort Benning, GA	133.4
Establish San Antonio Regional Medical Center and realign enlisted medical training to Fort Sam Houston, TX	103.9
Close Naval Air Station Brunswick, ME	99.9
Consolidate Transportation Command components at Scott Air Force Base, IL	96.8
Close Fort McPherson, GA	94.2
Close Brooks City-Base, TX	91.6
Realign by converting medical inpatient services to clinics at various installations	90.8
Consolidate depot-level reparable procurement management	81.0
Close Naval Station Ingleside, TX, and realign Naval Air Station Corpus Christi, TX	68.5
Realign to create a Naval Integrated Weapons and Armaments Research, Development, and Acquisition, Test and Evaluation Center mostly at Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake, CA	67.9
Close Fort Monroe, VA	65.3
Close National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency leased locations and realign others at Fort Belvoir, VA	57.3
Realign to relocate Air Defense Artillery Center and School at Fort Sill, OK	50.0
Close Naval Air Station Willow Grove, PA, and realign Cambria Regional Airport, Johnstown, PA	46.2
Co-locate missile and space defense agencies at Redstone Arsenal, AL	46.1
Consolidate Defense Information Systems Agency at Fort Meade, MD	45.7
Realign defense research service-led laboratories at multiple locations	43.3
Close Naval Station Pascagoula, MS	41.9
Reserve Component Transformation, TX	41.3
Close Naval Air Station Atlanta, GA	41.2
Close Fort Gillem, GA	39.1
Realign Mountain Home Air Force Base, ID	38.4
Realign to consolidate maritime command, control, communications, computers, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance, research, development, and acquisition, test and evaluation functions at multiple locations	38.2
Realign Army Reserve Command and Control - Northeast	35.4
Co-locate miscellaneous Army leased locations	33.7
Establish joint bases at multiple locations	32.3
Realign Naval Support Activity, New Orleans, LA	27.6
Close Onizuka Air Force Station, CA	27.5
Realign Red River Army Depot, TX	26.3

Realign Grand Forks Air Force Base, ND	25.1
Relocate Army headquarters and field operating activities	22.7
Reserve Component Transformation, AL	20.5
Reserve Component Transformation, IA	20.5
Close U.S. Army Garrison Michigan at Selfridge	19.8
Close General Mitchell Air Reserve Station, WI	18.8
Realign supply, storage, and distribution management	18.7
Close Lone Star Army Ammunition Plant, TX	18.4
Reserve Component Transformation, OK	18.4
Close Navy Reserve Centers	18.1
Consolidate civilian personnel offices within military departments and defense agencies	17.8
Realign Robins Air Force Base, GA	16.8
Close Naval Weapons Station, Seal Beach, Concord, CA	16.5
Realign Eielson Air Force Base, AK	15.7
Reserve Component Transformation, LA	15.6
Reserve Component Transformation, PA	15.5
Close Galena Forward Operating Location, AK	14.2
Realign medical functions at McChord Air Force Base, WA	13.7
Realign commodity management privatization	13.5
Close Kulis Air Guard Station, AK	12.6
Reserve Component Transformation, WI	12.5
Realign Army Reserve Command and Control - Northwest	12.4
Close Navy Recruiting Districts	11.8
Close Naval Facilities Engineering Field Division/Activity	11.2
Reserve Component Transformation, CA	11.0
Realign to relocate undergraduate pilot and navigator training	10.9
Realign Fort Smith Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, AR	10.8
Close Kansas Army Ammunition Plant, KS	10.6
Consolidate Defense Commissary Agency Eastern and Midwestern Regions, and Hopewell, VA, offices	10.5
Reserve Component Transformation, HI	10.5
Reserve Component Transformation, OH	10.4
Consolidate Army Test and Evaluation Command Headquarters at Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD	10.1
Reserve Component Transformation, WA	9.7
Realign Beale Air Force Base, CA	9.2
Close Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Centers	9.2
Realign Naval Air Station New Orleans and Air Reserve Station, LA	8.8
Reserve Component Transformation, WV	8.7
Realign Army Reserve Command and Control - New England	8.7
Reserve Component Transformation, PR	8.6
Reserve Component Transformation, NE	7.3
Reserve Component Transformation, MO	7.2
Reserve Component Transformation, AZ	7.1
Close Riverbank Army Ammunition Plant, CA	6.8
Reserve Component Transformation, GA	6.7
Establish Air Force logistics support centers	6.6
Reserve Component Transformation, AR	6.5
Realign Hill Air Force Base, UT	6.4
Reserve Component Transformation, CT	6.4
Realign to create joint centers of excellence for chemical, biological, and medical research and development and acquisition	6.1
Realign Watervliet Arsenal, NY	6.0
Realign Sierra Army Depot, CA	5.8
Relocate miscellaneous Department of the Navy leased locations	5.7
Reserve Component Transformation, RI	5.4

Realign Defense Intelligence Agency functions	5.3
Reserve Component Transformation, KY	5.2
Reserve Component Transformation, WY	5.1
Close Mississippi Army Ammunition Plant, MS	5.1
Realign Army Reserve Command and Control - Southwest	4.9
Realign Portland International Airport Air Guard Station, OR	4.8
Realign Marine Corps Logistics Base, Barstow, CA	4.6
Realign Lackland Air Force Base, TX	4.2
Reserve Component Transformation, NY	4.2
Reserve Component Transformation, IL	3.8
Close Navy Supply Corps School, Athens, GA	3.8
Realign Navy Reserve Readiness Commands	3.7
Realign Navy Regions	3.6
Reserve Component Transformation, NJ	3.5
Reserve Component Transformation, NM	3.5
Reserve Component Transformation, NH	3.4
Co-locate miscellaneous OSD, defense agency, and field activity leased locations	3.2
Close Marine Corps Support Activity, Kansas City, MO	3.2
Reserve Component Transformation, IN	3.1
Reserve Component Transformation, NC	3.1
Reserve Component Transformation, TN	3.0
Consolidate media organizations into a new agency for media and publications at Fort Meade, MD	3.0
Realign Single Drill Sergeant School to Fort Jackson, SC	2.6
Realign Naval Weapons Station, Seal Beach, CA	2.5
Reserve Component Transformation, MI	2.5
Realign Army Reserve Command and Control - Southeast	2.4
Consolidate correctional facilities into joint regional correctional facilities	2.0
Reserve Component Transformation, MD	2.0
Co-locate defense and military department adjudication activities	1.9
Realign Richmond International Airport Air Guard Station, VA	1.9
Reserve Component Transformation, MT	1.9
Realign to establish Joint Center of Excellence for culinary training at Fort Lee, VA	1.7
Realign to establish centers for rotary wing air platform Development, and Acquisition, Test and Evaluation Center at Patuxent River, MD, and Redstone Arsenal, AL	1.7
Reserve Component Transformation, MA	1.7
Realign Naval Submarine Base, New London, CT	1.6
Realign to establish Joint Center for consolidated transportation management training at Fort Lee, VA	1.5
Reserve Component Transformation, DE	1.4
Realign to create an integrated weapons and armaments specialty site for guns and ammunition at Picatinny Arsenal, NJ	1.4
Realign Ship Intermediate Maintenance Activity, Norfolk, VA	1.4
Establish F100 engine centralized intermediate repair facilities	1.3
Reserve Component Transformation, VT	1.3
Realign Naval Shipyard Detachments	1.1
Co-locate miscellaneous Air Force leased locations and National Guard Headquarters leased locations	1.1
Realign Andrews Air Force Base, MD	0.9
Realign Langley Air Force Base, VA, by establishing a centralized intermediate repair facility – F-15 Avionics at Tyndall Air Force Base, FL	0.9
Create joint mobilization sites	0.9
Co-locate military department investigation agencies with DOD Counterintelligence and Security Agency at Marine Corps Base Quantico, VA	0.8



Realign Officer Training Command, Naval Air Station, Pensacola, FL	0.8
Realign Rock Island Arsenal, IL	0.6
Realign to relocate Army Prime Power School training at Fort Leonard Wood, MO	0.5
Reserve Component Transformation, OR	0.2
Realign Fairchild Air Force Base, WA	0.2
Realign to establish Joint Center of Excellence for religious training and education at Fort Jackson, SC	0.2
Realign to create an air integrated weapons and armaments Research, Development, and Acquisition, Test and Evaluation Center at Eglin Air Force Base, FL	0.1
Realign Ellington Field Air Guard Station, TX	0.1
Realign Fort Wainwright, AK	0.1
Reserve Component Transformation, MN	0.0
Realign Boise Air Terminal Air Guard Station, ID	0.0
Close Newport Chemical Depot, IN	0.0
Close Umatilla Chemical Depot, OR	0.0
Close Deseret Chemical Depot, UT	0.0
Realign to consolidate sea vehicle Development, and Acquisition to Naval Surface Warfare Center Carderock Division, MD, and Naval Sea Systems Command, DC	0.0
Realign Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, OH	(0.0)
Realign Key Field Air Guard Station, MS	(0.0)
Realign Hector International Airport Air Guard Station, ND	(0.0)
Reserve Component Transformation, ND	(0.0)
Close W.K. Kellogg Airport Air Guard Station, MI	(0.0)
Relocate Air Force Real Property Agency	(0.1)
Realign Capital Airport Air Guard Station, IL	(0.1)
Realign to establish centers for fixed wing air platform Research, Development, and Acquisition, Test and Evaluation Center at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH, and Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake, CA	(0.1)
Realign Mansfield-Lahm Air Guard Station, OH	(0.1)
Realign Bradley International Airport Air Guard Station, CT	(0.2)
Realign to consolidate ground vehicle Development and Acquisition in a joint center at Detroit Arsenal, MI	(0.4)
Relocate medical command headquarters	(0.9)
Realign Naval Station Newport, RI	(1.3)
Realign Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station, NY	(1.7)
Realign Nashville International Airport Air Guard Station, TN	(2.6)
Realign Otis Air National Guard Base, MA, and Lambert-St. Louis International Airport Air Guard Station, MO	(6.2)
Realign March Air Reserve Base, CA	(6.9)
Realign to establish Joint Strike Fighter initial joint training site at Eglin Air Force Base, FL	(13.5)
Realign Great Falls International Airport Air Guard Station, MT	(14.7)
Realign Fort Bragg, NC	(38.3)
Realign Martin State Air Guard Station, MD	(41.4)
Realign Fort Hood, TX	(105.8)
Realign Operational Army (Integrated Global Presence and Basing Strategy)	(324.8)
<b>Total net annual recurring savings for all BRAC recommendations</b>	<b>\$3,808.1</b>

Source: GAO analysis based on DOD's fiscal year 2011 BRAC budget data.

Note: Totals may not equal the sum due to rounding.

<sup>a</sup>Data provided by DOD for fiscal year 2012 expected recurring costs and savings.

<sup>b</sup> In May 2005, DOD proposed closing Cannon AFB, New Mexico. In September 2005, the BRAC Commission stated that Cannon could remain open if DOD identified a new mission for the base. Subsequently, the Air Force announced in June 2006 that Cannon would remain open because it plans to activate a new mission at the base. The Air Force BRAC Office said it claimed these savings because the decision to reallocate Air Force resources and mission to Cannon was made after the BRAC recommendation was approved and was, therefore, a non-BRAC programmatic decision.

**Enclosure VI: Dollar Differences in Net Annual Recurring Savings from BRAC Commission Estimates to Fiscal Year 2011 DOD Budget**

**Table 9: Dollar Differences in Net Annual Recurring Savings from BRAC Commission Estimates to Fiscal Year 2011 DOD Budget**

(current-year dollars in millions)			
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>2005 BRAC Commission estimate</b>	<b>Fiscal year 2011 DOD budget</b>	<b>Dollar difference</b>
Realign supply, storage, and distribution management	\$203.2	\$18.7	(\$184.5)
Establish joint bases at multiple locations	183.8	32.3	(151.4)
Consolidate depot-level reparable procurement management	156.8	81.0	(75.7)
Close National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency leased locations and realign others at Fort Belvoir, VA	127.7	57.3	(70.4)
Co-locate miscellaneous OSD, defense agency, and field activity leased locations	67.0	3.2	(63.8)
Realign Fort Hood, TX	(45.3)	(105.8)	(60.5)
Realign Grand Forks Air Force Base, ND	66.7	25.1	(41.6)
Close Deseret Chemical Depot, UT	38.0	0.0	(38.0)
Close Umatilla Chemical Depot, OR	34.7	0.0	(34.7)
Realign Otis Air National Guard Base, MA, and Lambert-St. Louis International Airport Air Guard Station, MO	27.9	(6.2)	(34.1)
Relocate medical command headquarters	32.9	(0.9)	(33.9)
Realign commodity management privatization	43.8	13.5	(30.3)
Realign Operational Army (Integrated Global Presence and Basing Strategy)	(294.7)	(324.8)	(30.1)
Co-locate miscellaneous Air Force leased locations and National Guard Headquarters leased locations	30.8	1.1	(29.8)
Close Naval Air Station Willow Grove, PA, and realign Cambria Regional Airport, Johnstown, PA	73.9	46.2	(27.7)
Establish San Antonio Regional Medical Center and realign enlisted medical training to Fort Sam Houston, TX	129.0	103.9	(25.1)
Co-locate military department investigation agencies with DOD Counterintelligence and Security Agency at Marine Corps Base Quantico, VA	25.7	0.8	(24.8)
Realign Great Falls International Airport Air Guard Station, MT	(0.1)	(14.7)	(14.6)
Realign Fort Bragg, NC	(23.8)	(38.3)	(14.6)
Realign Martin State Air Guard Station, MD	(27.4)	(41.4)	(14.0)
Realign Marine Corps Logistics Base, Barstow, CA	18.4	4.6	(13.8)
Consolidate Defense Information Systems Agency at Fort Meade, MD	59.4	45.7	(13.6)
Consolidate correctional facilities into joint regional correctional facilities	14.7	2.0	(12.7)
Relocate miscellaneous Department of the Navy leased locations	18.0	5.7	(12.3)
Close Newport Chemical Depot, IN	10.9	0.0	(10.9)
Close Brooks City-Base, TX	102.1	91.6	(10.4)
Realign to establish Joint Strike Fighter initial joint training site at Eglin Air Force Base, FL	(3.3)	(13.5)	(10.2)
Realign to create an integrated weapons and armaments specialty site for guns and ammunition at Picatinny Arsenal, NJ	9.1	1.4	(7.7)
Realign Naval Support Activity New Orleans, LA	35.3	27.6	(7.7)
Realign March Air Reserve Base, CA	0.8	(6.9)	(7.7)
Realign to relocate undergraduate pilot and navigator training	18.3	10.9	(7.4)
Realign Mansfield-Lahm Air Guard Station, OH	6.7	(0.1)	(6.8)
Realign Ship Intermediate Maintenance Activity Norfolk, VA	8.2	1.4	(6.8)

Consolidate media organizations into a new agency for media and publications at Fort Meade, MD	9.6	3.0	(6.6)
Realign Boise Air Terminal Air Guard Station, ID	6.1	0.0	(6.1)
Close Naval Station Pascagoula, MS	47.4	41.9	(5.5)
Realign Andrews Air Force Base, MD	6.4	0.9	(5.4)
Realign Defense Intelligence Agency functions	10.1	5.3	(4.8)
Consolidate Transportation Command components at Scott Air Force Base, IL	101.5	96.8	(4.7)
Consolidate civilian personnel offices within military department and defense agencies	22.2	17.8	(4.4)
Close Kulis Air Guard Station, AK	16.4	12.6	(3.9)
Co-locate defense and military department adjudication activities	5.7	1.9	(3.8)
Realign by converting medical inpatient services to clinics at various installations	93.9	90.8	(3.1)
Close Marine Corps Support Activity Kansas City, MO	6.1	3.2	(2.9)
Realign Naval Submarine Base New London, CT	4.4	1.6	(2.8)
Realign to establish centers for fixed wing air platform Research, Development, and Acquisition, Test and Evaluation Center at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH, and Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake, CA	2.7	(0.1)	(2.8)
Close Navy Recruiting Districts	14.5	11.8	(2.7)
Realign Navy Reserve Readiness Commands	6.5	3.7	(2.7)
Realign Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, OH	2.5	(0.0)	(2.5)
Realign Bradley International Airport Air Guard Station, CT	2.2	(0.2)	(2.5)
Realign Rock Island Arsenal, IL	3.1	0.6	(2.4)
Realign to consolidate ground vehicle Development, and Acquisition in a joint center at Detroit Arsenal, MI	1.9	(0.4)	(2.3)
Realign Naval Station Newport, RI	1.0	(1.3)	(2.3)
Realign Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station, NY	0.3	(1.7)	(2.0)
Realign Capital Airport Air Guard Station, IL	1.9	(0.1)	(1.9)
Realign Sierra Army Depot, CA	7.5	5.8	(1.7)
Realign Hill Air Force Base, UT	8.2	6.4	(1.7)
Close W.K. Kellogg Airport Air Guard Station, MI	1.5	(0.0)	(1.5)
Realign to create an air integrated weapons and armaments Research, Development, and Acquisition, Test and Evaluation Center at Eglin Air Force Base, FL	1.4	0.1	(1.3)
Relocate Army headquarters and field operating activities	23.9	22.7	(1.2)
Realign to create joint centers of excellence for chemical, biological, and medical research and development and acquisition	7.3	6.1	(1.2)
Realign Naval Shipyard Detachments	2.3	1.1	(1.1)
Realign to establish centers for rotary wing air platform Development, and Acquisition, Test and Evaluation Center at Patuxent River, MD, and Redstone Arsenal, AL	2.8	1.7	(1.1)
Realign Hector International Airport Air Guard Station, ND	1.0	(0.0)	(1.0)
Relocate Air Force Real Property Agency	0.9	(0.1)	(1.0)
Realign Key Field Air Guard Station, MS	0.9	(0.0)	(1.0)
Realign Richmond International Airport Air Guard Station, VA	2.8	1.9	(0.9)
Realign Fairchild Air Force Base, WA	0.9	0.2	(0.8)
Realign to establish Joint Center of Excellence for religious training and education at Fort Jackson, SC	0.9	0.2	(0.7)
Close Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Centers	9.8	9.2	(0.5)
Realign Army Reserve Command and Control - Northeast	35.9	35.4	(0.5)
Realign Ellington Field Air Guard Station, TX	0.3	0.1	(0.2)
Realign to consolidate sea vehicle Development, and Acquisition to Naval Surface Warfare Center Carderock Division, MD, and Naval Sea Systems Command, DC	0.2	0.0	(0.2)
Reserve Component Transformation, VT	1.4	1.3	(0.1)

Reserve Component Transformation, OR	0.3	0.2	(0.1)
Reserve Component Transformation, MA	1.7	1.7	(0.0)
Reserve Component Transformation, ND	(0.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)
Realign Officer Training Command, Naval Air Station, Pensacola, FL	0.8	0.8	(0.0)
Realign Army Reserve Command and Control - Southeast	2.4	2.4	(0.0)
Realign Fort Wainwright, AK	0.1	0.1	0.0
Realign to relocate Army Prime Power School training at Fort Leonard Wood, MO	0.5	0.5	0.0
Reserve Component Transformation, MN	(0.0)	0.0	0.0
Close Mississippi Army Ammunition Plant, MS	5.1	5.1	0.1
Create joint mobilization sites	0.8	0.9	0.1
Realign Single Drill Sergeant School to Fort Jackson, SC	2.5	2.6	0.1
Close Naval Weapons Station, Seal Beach, Concord, CA	16.4	16.5	0.1
Realign Langley Air Force Base, VA by establishing a centralized intermediate repair facility – F-15 Avionics at Tyndall Air Force Base, FL	0.7	0.9	0.2
Establish F100 engine centralized intermediate repair facilities	1.1	1.3	0.2
Reserve Component Transformation, NY	4.0	4.2	0.2
Realign to establish Joint Center for consolidated transportation management training at Fort Lee, VA	1.3	1.5	0.2
Realign Army Reserve Command and Control - New England	8.4	8.7	0.3
Close Riverbank Army Ammunition Plant, CA	6.5	6.8	0.3
Reserve Component Transformation, TN	2.7	3.0	0.3
Reserve Component Transformation, MD	1.7	2.0	0.3
Reserve Component Transformation, NH	3.1	3.4	0.3
Close Kansas Army Ammunition Plant, KS	10.3	10.6	0.3
Reserve Component Transformation, MI	2.1	2.5	0.3
Realign to establish Joint Center of Excellence for culinary training at Fort Lee, VA	1.4	1.7	0.3
Reserve Component Transformation, IL	3.5	3.8	0.4
Reserve Component Transformation, MT	1.5	1.9	0.4
Reserve Component Transformation, IN	2.7	3.1	0.4
Reserve Component Transformation, NC	2.6	3.1	0.4
Reserve Component Transformation, NM	3.0	3.5	0.4
Realign Naval Air Station New Orleans Air Reserve Station, LA	8.3	8.8	0.5
Reserve Component Transformation, NJ	3.0	3.5	0.5
Establish Air Force logistics support centers	6.1	6.6	0.5
Reserve Component Transformation, DE	0.9	1.4	0.5
Reserve Component Transformation, CT	5.8	6.4	0.6
Reserve Component Transformation, WY	4.5	5.1	0.7
Realign Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach, CA	1.8	2.5	0.7
Reserve Component Transformation, AR	5.8	6.5	0.7
Reserve Component Transformation, RI	4.6	5.4	0.8
Realign Watervliet Arsenal, NY	5.2	6.0	0.8
Reserve Component Transformation, MO	6.4	7.2	0.8
Realign Navy Regions	2.7	3.6	0.8
Reserve Component Transformation, KY	4.3	5.2	0.9
Close Lone Star Army Ammunition Plant, TX	17.3	18.4	1.0
Reserve Component Transformation, IA	19.4	20.5	1.1
Realign Portland International Airport Air Guard Station, OR	3.7	4.8	1.1
Reserve Component Transformation, NE	6.2	7.3	1.1
Reserve Component Transformation, OH	9.3	10.4	1.1
Reserve Component Transformation, WV	7.6	8.7	1.1
Reserve Component Transformation, AZ	5.9	7.1	1.2
Realign Lackland Air Force Base, TX	2.9	4.2	1.3
Realign Army Reserve Command and Control - Northwest	11.1	12.4	1.3

Reserve Component Transformation, PR	7.3	8.6	1.3
Reserve Component Transformation, PA	14.2	15.5	1.3
Reserve Component Transformation, HI	9.2	10.5	1.4
Consolidate Army Test and Evaluation Command Headquarters at Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD	8.7	10.1	1.4
Reserve Component Transformation, WA	8.2	9.7	1.5
Realign Army Reserve Command and Control - Southwest	3.4	4.9	1.5
Close Onizuka Air Force Station, CA	25.9	27.5	1.6
Reserve Component Transformation, GA	5.0	6.7	1.6
Reserve Component Transformation, WI	10.8	12.5	1.7
Close U.S. Army Garrison Michigan at Selfridge	18.1	19.8	1.7
Reserve Component Transformation, OK	16.5	18.4	1.8
Close Galena Forward Operating Location, AK	12.3	14.2	1.9
Close Naval Facilities Engineering Field Division/Activity	9.3	11.2	1.9
Reserve Component Transformation, LA	13.6	15.6	2.0
Reserve Component Transformation, CA	8.9	11.0	2.0
Realign medical functions at McChord Air Force Base, WA	11.6	13.7	2.1
Close Navy Reserve Centers	15.9	18.1	2.2
Realign Robins Air Force Base, GA	14.7	16.8	2.2
Close Navy Supply Corps School Athens, GA	1.6	3.8	2.2
Realign defense research service-led laboratories at multiple locations	40.8	43.3	2.6
Reserve Component Transformation, AL	17.8	20.5	2.7
Realign Pope Air Force Base, NC	209.8	212.5	2.7
Realign to consolidate maritime command, control, communications, computers, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance, research, development, and acquisition, test and evaluation functions at multiple locations	34.8	38.2	3.4
Realign Eielson Air Force Base, AK	12.1	15.7	3.6
Realign Red River Army Depot, TX	22.5	26.3	3.7
Close Fort Gillem, GA	35.3	39.1	3.8
Consolidate Defense Commissary Agency Eastern and Midwestern Regions, and Hopewell, VA, offices	6.7	10.5	3.9
Reserve Component Transformation, TX	36.0	41.3	5.3
Co-locate miscellaneous Army leased locations	27.8	33.7	5.9
Realign to relocate Air Defense Artillery Center and School at Fort Sill, OK	42.6	50.0	7.4
Close Naval Air Station Atlanta, GA	33.7	41.2	7.5
Close Fort Monmouth, NJ	146.0	153.7	7.7
Close Fort Monroe, VA	56.9	65.3	8.4
Close Naval Station Ingleside, TX and realign Naval Air Station Corpus Christi, TX	59.5	68.5	9.0
Co-locate missile and space defense agencies at Redstone Arsenal, AL	36.1	46.1	10.0
Realign Maneuver Training to Fort Benning, GA	123.3	133.4	10.1
Realign Fort Smith Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, AR	0.4	10.8	10.5
Realign Beale Air Force Base, CA	(1.7)	9.2	11.0
Close Naval Air Station Brunswick, ME	88.7	99.9	11.2
Close Fort McPherson, GA	82.1	94.2	12.1
Realign Mountain Home Air Force Base, ID	23.8	38.4	14.6
Realign to create a Naval Integrated Weapons and Armaments Research, Development, and Acquisition, Test and Evaluation Center mostly at Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake, CA	52.1	67.9	15.8
Realign to establish Combat Service Support Center at Fort Lee, VA	131.8	148.4	16.6
Realign Nashville International Airport Air Guard Station, TN	(20.7)	(2.6)	18.1
Consolidate/co-locate active and reserve personnel and recruiting centers for Army and Air Force	151.2	169.6	18.4

Close General Mitchell Air Reserve Station, WI	0.0	18.8	18.8
Realign Walter Reed Army Medical Center to Bethesda National Naval Medical Center, MD, and to Fort Belvoir, VA	145.3	172.1	26.8
Realign to establish fleet readiness centers	248.4	278.4	30.0
Realign Cannon Air Force Base, NM	206.5	260.0	53.5
Consolidate Defense Finance and Accounting Service	102.6	498.9	396.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$4,222.9</b>	<b>\$3,808.1</b>	<b>(\$414.8)</b>

Source: GAO analysis of 2005 BRAC Commission data and DOD's fiscal year 2011 BRAC budget data.

Note: Negative numbers in parenthesis are costs. Totals may not equal the sum of the numbers in each column, due to rounding.

**Enclosure VII: Comments from the Department of Defense**



**OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE**

3000 DEFENSE PENTAGON  
WASHINGTON, DC 20301-3000

JUN 21 2012

Mr. Brian Lepore  
Director, Defense Capabilities and Management  
U.S. Government Accountability Office  
441 G Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20548

Dear Mr. Lepore:

This is the Department of Defense (DoD) response to the GAO Draft Report, GAO-12-709R, "MILITARY BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURES: Updated Costs and Savings Estimates for BRAC 2005," dated May 16, 2012 (GAO Code 351722).

The report accurately describes changes in costs and savings from the original Commission estimates to the Department's final cost and savings data. As stated publicly, the Department continues to believe that the BRAC process is the only fair, objective, and proven process for closing and realigning bases in the United States.

We continue to appreciate the good working relationship that exists among our staffs and look forward to continuing this into the future as GAO examines lessons learned from BRAC 2005.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Dorothy Robyn".

Dorothy Robyn  
Deputy Under Secretary of Defense  
(Installations and Environment)



## Related GAO Products

*Military Base Realignments and Closures: Key Factors Contributing to BRAC 2005 Results.* [GAO-12-513T](#). Washington, D.C.: March 8, 2012.

*Excess Facilities: DOD Needs More Complete Information and a Strategy to Guide Its Future Disposal Efforts.* [GAO-11-814](#). Washington, D.C.: September 19, 2011.

*Military Base Realignments and Closures: Review of the Iowa and Milan Army Ammunition Plants.* [GAO-11-488R](#). Washington, D.C.: April 1, 2011.

*GAO's 2011 High-Risk Series: An Update.* [GAO-11-394T](#). Washington, D.C.: February 17, 2011.

*Defense Infrastructure: High-Level Federal Interagency Coordination Is Warranted to Address Transportation Needs beyond the Scope of the Defense Access Roads Program.* [GAO-11-165](#). Washington, D.C.: January 26, 2011.

*Military Base Realignments and Closures: DOD Is Taking Steps to Mitigate Challenges but Is Not Fully Reporting Some Additional Costs.* [GAO-10-725R](#). Washington, D.C.: July 21, 2010.

*Defense Infrastructure: Army Needs to Improve Its Facility Planning Systems to Better Support Installations Experiencing Significant Growth.* [GAO-10-602](#). Washington, D.C.: June 24, 2010.

*Military Base Realignments and Closures: Estimated Costs Have Increased while Savings Estimates Have Decreased Since Fiscal Year 2009.* [GAO-10-98R](#). Washington, D.C.: November 13, 2009.

*Military Base Realignments and Closures: Transportation Impact of Personnel Increases Will Be Significant, but Long-Term Costs Are Uncertain and Direct Federal Support Is Limited.* [GAO-09-750](#). Washington, D.C.: September 9, 2009.

*Military Base Realignments and Closures: DOD Needs to Update Savings Estimates and Continue to Address Challenges in Consolidating Supply-Related Functions at Depot Maintenance Locations.* [GAO-09-703](#). Washington, D.C.: July 9, 2009.

*Defense Infrastructure: DOD Needs to Periodically Review Support Standards and Costs at Joint Bases and Better Inform Congress of Facility Sustainment Funding Uses.* [GAO-09-336](#). Washington, D.C.: March 30, 2009.

*Military Base Realignments and Closures: DOD Faces Challenges in Implementing Recommendations on Time and Is Not Consistently Updating Savings Estimates.* [GAO-09-217](#). Washington, D.C.: January 30, 2009.

*Military Base Realignments and Closures: Army Is Developing Plans to Transfer Functions from Fort Monmouth, New Jersey, to Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, but Challenges Remain.* [GAO-08-1010R](#). Washington, D.C.: August 13, 2008.

*Defense Infrastructure: High-Level Leadership Needed to Help Communities Address Challenges Caused by DOD-Related Growth.* [GAO-08-665](#). Washington, D.C.: June 17, 2008.

*Defense Infrastructure: DOD Funding for Infrastructure and Road Improvements Surrounding Growth Installations.* [GAO-08-602R](#). Washington, D.C.: April 1, 2008.

*Military Base Realignments and Closures: Higher Costs and Lower Savings Projected for Implementing Two Key Supply-Related BRAC Recommendations.* [GAO-08-315](#). Washington, D.C.: March 5, 2008.

*Defense Infrastructure: Realignment of Air Force Special Operations Command Units to Cannon Air Force Base, New Mexico.* [GAO-08-244R](#). Washington, D.C.: January 18, 2008.

*Military Base Realignments and Closures: Estimated Costs Have Increased and Estimated Savings Have Decreased.* [GAO-08-341T](#). Washington, D.C.: December 12, 2007.

*Military Base Realignments and Closures: Cost Estimates Have Increased and Are Likely to Continue to Evolve.* [GAO-08-159](#). Washington, D.C.: December 11, 2007.

*Military Base Realignments and Closures: Impact of Terminating, Relocating, or Outsourcing the Services of the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology.* [GAO-08-20](#). Washington, D.C.: November 9, 2007.

*Military Base Realignments and Closures: Transfer of Supply, Storage, and Distribution Functions from Military Services to Defense Logistics Agency.* [GAO-08-121R](#). Washington, D.C.: October 26, 2007.

*Defense Infrastructure: Challenges Increase Risks for Providing Timely Infrastructure Support for Army Installations Expecting Substantial Personnel Growth.* [GAO-07-1007](#). Washington, D.C.: September 13, 2007.

*Military Base Realignments and Closures: Plan Needed to Monitor Challenges for Completing More Than 100 Armed Forces Reserve Centers.* [GAO-07-1040](#). Washington, D.C.: September 13, 2007.

*Military Base Realignments and Closures: Observations Related to the 2005 Round.* [GAO-07-1203R](#). Washington, D.C.: September 6, 2007.

*Military Base Closures: Projected Savings from Fleet Readiness Centers Are Likely Overstated and Actions Needed to Track Actual Savings and Overcome Certain Challenges.* [GAO-07-304](#). Washington, D.C.: June 29, 2007.

*Military Base Closures: Management Strategy Needed to Mitigate Challenges and Improve Communication to Help Ensure Timely Implementation of Air National Guard Recommendations.* [GAO-07-641](#). Washington, D.C.: May 16, 2007.

*Military Base Closures: Opportunities Exist to Improve Environmental Cleanup Cost Reporting and to Expedite Transfer of Unneeded Property.* [GAO-07-166](#). Washington, D.C.: January 30, 2007.

*Military Bases: Observations on DOD's 2005 Base Realignment and Closure Selection Process and Recommendations.* [GAO-05-905](#). Washington, D.C.: July 18, 2005.

*Military Bases: Analysis of DOD's 2005 Selection Process and Recommendations for Base Closures and Realignment*s. [GAO-05-785](#). Washington, D.C.: July 1, 2005.

*Military Base Closures: Observations on Prior and Current BRAC Rounds*. [GAO-05-614](#). Washington, D.C.: May 3, 2005.

---

---

This is a work of the U.S. government and is not subject to copyright protection in the United States. The published product may be reproduced and distributed in its entirety without further permission from GAO. However, because this work may contain copyrighted images or other material, permission from the copyright holder may be necessary if you wish to reproduce this material separately.

---

## GAO's Mission

The Government Accountability Office, the audit, evaluation, and investigative arm of Congress, exists to support Congress in meeting its constitutional responsibilities and to help improve the performance and accountability of the federal government for the American people. GAO examines the use of public funds; evaluates federal programs and policies; and provides analyses, recommendations, and other assistance to help Congress make informed oversight, policy, and funding decisions. GAO's commitment to good government is reflected in its core values of accountability, integrity, and reliability.

---

## Obtaining Copies of GAO Reports and Testimony

The fastest and easiest way to obtain copies of GAO documents at no cost is through GAO's website ([www.gao.gov](http://www.gao.gov)). Each weekday afternoon, GAO posts on its website newly released reports, testimony, and correspondence. To have GAO e-mail you a list of newly posted products, go to [www.gao.gov](http://www.gao.gov) and select "E-mail Updates."

---

## Order by Phone

The price of each GAO publication reflects GAO's actual cost of production and distribution and depends on the number of pages in the publication and whether the publication is printed in color or black and white. Pricing and ordering information is posted on GAO's website, <http://www.gao.gov/ordering.htm>.

Place orders by calling (202) 512-6000, toll free (866) 801-7077, or TDD (202) 512-2537.

Orders may be paid for using American Express, Discover Card, MasterCard, Visa, check, or money order. Call for additional information.

---

## Connect with GAO

Connect with GAO on [Facebook](#), [Flickr](#), [Twitter](#), and [YouTube](#). Subscribe to our [RSS Feeds](#) or [E-mail Updates](#). Listen to our [Podcasts](#). Visit GAO on the web at [www.gao.gov](http://www.gao.gov).

---

## To Report Fraud, Waste, and Abuse in Federal Programs

Contact:

Website: [www.gao.gov/fraudnet/fraudnet.htm](http://www.gao.gov/fraudnet/fraudnet.htm)

E-mail: [fraudnet@gao.gov](mailto:fraudnet@gao.gov)

Automated answering system: (800) 424-5454 or (202) 512-7470

---

## Congressional Relations

Katherine Siggerud, Managing Director, [siggerudk@gao.gov](mailto:siggerudk@gao.gov), (202) 512-4400, U.S. Government Accountability Office, 441 G Street NW, Room 7125, Washington, DC 20548

---

## Public Affairs

Chuck Young, Managing Director, [youngc1@gao.gov](mailto:youngc1@gao.gov), (202) 512-4800 U.S. Government Accountability Office, 441 G Street NW, Room 7149 Washington, DC 20548

